

1490. p. 97. 6
THE

Proper, True, and Supreme

DEITY

OF

Our LORD and SAVIOUR

JESUS CHRIST,

Proved and asserted

FROM THE

Holy Scriptures.

Alex. Moncrieff

By a Minister of the Church of SCOTLAND.

Hear, O Israel, JEHOVAH, our God, is one JEHOVAH, Deut. vi. 4.

Whoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father, 1 John ii. 23.

If you despise the Son that you may honour the Father, he does not receive your Honour. When the Son is despised, the Father is no way glorified.

GAZON. Nat. orat. 31. p. 507.

EDINBURGH

Printed: And sold at most Book-sellers Shops in
Town. 1730.

®

THE
 Proper Time, and Supreme
DEITY



OUR LORD AND SAVIOUR
JESUS CHRIST
 Proved and asserted
 FROM THE
Holy Scriptures.

By a Minister of the Church of Scotland.
 Hymn O Lord, Jehovah, our God, is one Person.
 VAN, Dorn, vi. 4
 The Father dwells in the Son, the Son dwells in the Father.
 John ii. 20
 If you believe the Son that you may believe the Father,
 he that has not received your Mission. When the Son is
 glorified, the Father is in him glorified.
 GRACIOUS. Rev. ed. 1797.

EDINBURGH
 Printed: And sold at most Book-sellers Shops in
 Town. 1730.

hat
 Kno
 ere
 Holy
 ur
 est
 Kno
 ises
 and
 erro
 Go
 hem
 our
 lov
 roa



INTRODUCTION

IT will be of little Use to the Reader, or Service to my self, to make any Apology for publishing the following Essay at this Time. I shall therefore content my self with narrating, that it was the Opinion of some of a Superior Knowledge and Judgment to mine, that what is here deliver'd is seasonable, and agreeable to the Holy Scriptures, and the Doctrine laid down in our *Confession of Faith and Catechisms*. And reflecting how that many either want Time, or Knowledge sufficient to read the excellent Treatises of learned Men on this sublime Subject, and hoping this small Preservative against the Errors of the Times, might, by the Blessing of God, prove in that Respect more serviceable to them, than the more critical and accurate Discourses of the Learned; I was prevail'd with to allow this Performance, such as it is, to go abroad.

Mr

Monmouth

*Proper, True & supreme
Went / Edinburgh 1730*

My Design is not to impose a Meaning and Sense of my own, upon Mr. *Simson's* Words, or in the least to reflect upon his Character. As I have conceived no Manner of Prejudice against him, so I heartily wish him well. What I have in View, is, according to my small Measure of Knowledge in so momentuous and important an Article, to prove and assert from the Holy Scriptures, the great and fundamental Doctrine of the Proper Supreme Deity of our Lord and Saviour *Jesus Christ*, that has been attacked and subverted, by the Propositions found relevant and proven against him, by the Assemblies of this Church. If my Endeavours have the Effect, to excite others of greater Abilities to manage this Argument to better Purpose, I shall think my self well rewarded.

THE Doctrine received in this Church, is as follows. *Confess. Ch. II. Sect. 1.* The Unity of God is asserted in thir Terms, *There is but one only, living, and true God: Who is infinite in Being and Perfection--* § 2. God essentially considered is described, *God hath all Life, Glory, Goodness, Blessedness, in and of himself; and is alone in, and unto himself All-sufficient. --- He is the alone Fountain of all Being, of whom, through whom, and to whom are all Things; and hath most Sovereign Dominion over them. -- To him is due from Angels and Men, -- Worship, Service. --* And in § 3. It is immediately subjoined, *In the Unity of the Godhead there be three Persons, of one Substance, Power, and Eternity; God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost. The Father is of none, neither begotten, nor proceeding:*

Introduction.

V

ceeding: *The Son is eternally begotten of the Father; The Holy Ghost eternally proceeding from the Father and the Son.* And Ch. viii. § 2. *The Son of God, the second Person in the Trinity, being very and eternal God, of one Substance, and equal with the Father—*And larger Catech. Answ. to Quest. ix. the same Doctrine is maintain'd, *There be three Persons in the Godhead, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one, true, eternal God, the same in Substance equal in Power and Glory; Although distinguished by their personal Properties.*

Bishop Bull has sufficiently shewn in his *Defensio Fidei Nicenæ, Judicium Ecclesiæ, and Primitiva Traditio*, That the Catholick Church did all along profess a Trinity of Persons *consubstantial, co-eternal*, in Unity of Nature, Substance and Godhead. And Bishop Stillingfleet has pursued the same Argument. And a modern Author* who has distinguished himself by his Knowledge of the *Ancients* has asserted, That that Definition of one *self-existent, underived, independent, supreme Being*, hath long passed current with Men who believed a *Trinity of Divine Persons*: And that it is properly a Definition of the *Divine Nature*, abstracting from the Consideration of the *Distinction* of Persons.

Spanhem has taken Notice of the Artifice of *Sandius*, and of *Arius* before him, in loading those that maintain'd the *numerical Oneness* of Substance or *Essence*, with the Charge of *Sabellianism*. But it must be remember'd that the *Sabellians* own'd no other *Trinity* but of different

* Dr Waterland i. Def. P. 377.

rent Appearances and Manifestations of God to Mankind; and this we sufficiently escape, when we own, That tho' *there is no other God but one*, yet that *one* God is *Father, Son, and Spirit*, who each of them possess all Divine Perfections, and who are *proper Persons*, tho' not in the ordinary Meaning of the Term Person among Men; And that they are truly distinguished from one another, as the *unbegotten Father*, the *begotten Son*, and the *Spirit proceeding* from the *Father* and the *Son*: Tho' no Man can define the Nature, Measure, or Manner of that Distinction, because not reveal'd. This, however we are assur'd of, from the Word of God, that they are so distinct as to be three Persons, and so cannot be one Person: That they are so distinct, as the one cannot be the other, so distinct that the *Son* only assum'd human Flesh and suffer'd, and not the *Father*, nor the Holy Spirit: And yet they are so *one*, as to be of one *Substance* or *Essence* in *Number*, so as to be *one, true, eternal* God, so *one* as that the Definition of the *essence* of which above, agrees to each *Person*; so that we may safely affirm of the *Son* as well as of the *Father*, That he is the *self-existent, underrived, independent, supreme Being*.

It well deserves to be observ'd with what Judgment and Caution, that great Man, the learned and honourable Author of the critical History of the * *Creed*, has expressed himself as to the Manner of the *Generation*: "As for (says the Author) the Manner of the Father's eternal begetting of the Son, there are various Similitudes

* History of the Apost. Creed, P. 134.

Introduction. vii

tudes used by the Ancients to help our Con-
 ceptions therein. Only this I shall venture
 to affirm, That none of them do yield us any
 adequate or satisfactory Apprehension of this
 sublime and incomprehensible Mystery. For
 which Reason great Caution is to be used in
 our Searches thereinto, and Expressions there-
 of, that we do not with too great Nicety
 and Curiousness, dive into this profound and
 incomprehensible Secret, least whilst we endea-
 vour to shew our Learning and Knowledge,
 we betray our Ignorance, and, what is worse,
 conceive and utter Things unbecoming the
 Divine and infinite Majesty." See also P. 79.

FROM what we have seen advanced by this ce-
 lebrated Author, and from a View of the Scope,
 Design, and Connection of that learned Perform-
 ance, it is very manifest, that Mr. *Simson* in his
 Defences, (*State p. 102 and 103 compared*) im-
 poses a Meaning upon the Words of the Author
 very different from his own, when he cites these
 Words, p. 64. *viz.* "This Expression of *one*
God is to be understood, either absolutely, with-
 out regard to any other Article in the Creed,
 and so it denotes our Faith, that there is but
 one Eternal, Independent, Self-existent God."
 And alledges that the Author in this Place takes
 the Term Self-existent for Being of *None, i. e.*
 for the personal Property of the Father, and says,
 "This (Description) is to be understood of God
 the Father; as is plain from his (the Author's)
 Words in the preceeding Page, and what fol-
 lows in this." But if this Expression of *one*
 God, understood absolutely, and as denoting,
 that

that there is but one Eternal, Independent, Self-existent God, is to be understood of God the *Father*, as *Being of None*; which Mr. *Simson* all along inculcates to be the personal Property of the Father, and so not belonging to the Son; then, according to him, the Author here gives it as his Opinion, That the Father alone, in Exclusion of the Son, is one Eternal, Independent, Self-existent God. Now that the Words can bear no such Meaning is very manifest, as from other Considerations, so from the Author's expressly asserting p. 133. "That Christ is the true and natural Son of God, begotten by him before all Worlds;" and from his citing *Austin* with Approbation, (p. 80.) saying, *That when in the Creed the Name of God the Father is conjoined, it is thereby declared, That he was not first of all a God and afterwards a Father; but without any Beginning, He is always both God and Father*. That learned Author here asserts the Son's absolute Eternity, and that the Father without any Beginning was always Father, and consequently that there was no Instant, when he was without a Son. Since our God the Father *always* was a Father, it follows by a necessary Consequence, that he *always* had a Son, and that that Son of his had no Beginning of Being; and therefore it must be acknowledged that he is a *beginningless Being*, and that he is, together with the Father and Holy Spirit (according to the Description of the one God given by our learned Author) one Eternal, Independent, Self-existent God.

I might further observe, That the Author p. 63. preceeding, and p. 66 and 71. following the Passage cited, asserts that " This Clause of *one* God, was inserted to require our Belief, that there is but one Infinite, Supreme, Beginningless, and Eternal God; and that this one God, and none other, was the Father of our Lord *Jesus Christ*, and of all other Beings whatsoever, *Almighty*, Maker of Heaven and Earth."

And that this Clause was inserted in Opposition to the Heresy of the *Marcionites*, who asserted that " There were two co-eternal independent Beings, the one a good God, the Father of our Lord *Jesus Christ*, Author of the Gospel, and the Fountain, Source, and Origine of all Good; the other an evil God, the Creator of the World,— and Author of all Evil." And

I might also observe, that the learned Author takes notice of a Twofold Paternity included in the Character of *Father*, the one, denoting that Relation (75) wherein he stands to us Creatures, as he is the Cause, Author, and Origine of all Beings." The other, (p. 79) That peculiar Relation wherein God stands to his Son, that he is his Father, that he hath begotten him; the Manner whereof is peculiar, eminent and ineffable, and is not only impossible to be explicated by us, but such an Attempt would be both perilous and arrogant: For, *who can search out God to Perfection?*" It is plain that it is only the last Sense of Paternity that is peculiar to the Father, in Exclusion of the Son. The Author no where excludes the Son, from being Maker of Heaven
and

and Earth. And it is certain, that by the whole Strain of the Holy Scriptures, and the concurring Testimony of the ancient Writers, the Son is declared to be the Creator of the Universe, of Angels, of Men, and of all Things. From these Hints, and other Passages that are to be met with in that celebrated Author, it is very manifest that the Words above observed, as cited by Mr. *Simson*, make not in the least to his Purpose, as they do not against mine.

That I may say one Word more anent the Charge of *Sabellianism* against the Defenders of the numerical Oneness of Substance or Essence; I shall only observe that the *Sabellians* have been generally reckoned with the *Patripassians* *. *Noetus* taught that the Father was not different from the Son; that there was but one Person in God, who sometimes took the Name of Father, and sometimes that of Son; who was born of a Virgin, and suffered on the Cross. *Sabellius* seemed to own Three Persons, but considered them only as Three different Names and Virtues. And if he be thought to have refined upon the *Noetian* Scheme, it was (saith a learned Author †) by denying a *God incarnate*, after the Example of the earlier Hereticks; and also he may be looked upon as holding nearly the same Principles with the modern *Socinians*. But if we consider that Substance or *substantia*, according to the common Acceptation of the Word among the *Latins*, and its Definition among Philosophers, is *ens per se existens*; and that according to the plain Principles of natural Religion, it is both

* *Aug. Hæres.* 41. † *D. Waterland. Def.* p. 334.

Introduction.

xi

both demonstrable that God exists, and that he is an *independent* and *necessary Being* or *Substance*, and that no other Being or Substance can possibly be such. The Charge may be retorted against these, if any such there are, who contend that the Substance is not one in Number, and therefore certainly Two or three in Number; and at the same Time suppose that Independence and Necessary Existence may be taken for the personal Properties of the *Father*. For that Substance alone, which is necessary and independent, must be God *only* in the proper Sense of the Word; which is in Effect to say, that there is but one *Person* who is *truly* God.

It is our Duty to believe and live up to what is revealed in the Holy Scriptures concerning this incomprehensible Mystery, and to beware of going upon our own Fancies and Conjectures, in a Thing of this kind, which will be only a betraying too little Reverence for the tremendous and unsearchable Nature of God, and too high an Opinion of our own selves. I shall only say that I have made it my Business to keep close by the Sentiments and Expressions of such Orthodox Divines as I have had Occasion to see or consider upon this Subject. And if I have happened, contrary to my Design, to utter any Thing amiss in such an incomprehensible Mystery, I shall be heartily sorry for it, and ready to own it. I frankly acknowledge that I have borrowed with all Freedom, from the celebrated Authors, that have handled this Subject both formerly and of late; and have commonly delivered my self in the Words of some one or other of them,

them, as thinking them better and more safe than my own. I trouble the *Reader* no further, but recommend him, and my small Endeavours to the *Divine Blessing*.



THE



T H E

TRUE and SUPREME DEITY
of our Lord and Saviour
JESUS CHRIST
proved and asserted from
the Holy Scriptures.

JOHN I. I. *And the Word was God.*

C H A P. I.

JOHN I. I. *Explained.*

THE Title given our *Lord*
in the Text, is that of the
Word. He is the Eternal
and Essential *Word* *, by
whom the Heavens and all
their Hosts were made, and by whom
the Perfections, Will, and Counsels of
God have been revealed and manifest-
ed *,

* Verbum substantiale non prolatum. Fulgentii lib. 3.

ed *, to be the Object of the eternal Wonder of Angels and Men; and he is the Scope and principal Matter, both of the prophetical and promissory Word. For which, and other Reasons, our *Jesus* is here called the *Word*.

OUR Evangelist having ascribed to the Lord *Jesus* the Character of the *Word*; a Name by which the Second Person of the blessed Trinity was well known † among the *Jews*; he affirms of him, That he was God in the Beginning.

THE Term God affirmed of the Son, by the Apostle, is not to be understood in a *relative*, *subordinate*, or *improper* Sense; because a subordinate God is not God: And tho' Magistrates are called Gods, in respect of their Office; and *Moses* is said to be a God to *Pharaoh*; yet the Word *God* is affirmed of no Creature in Scripture, absolutely and in the singular

* The Father of our Lord *Jesus Christ* is revealed and manifested to Angels and Archangels, to Principalities and Powers, and to Men, by his Word, who is his Son. *Irenaeus*, lib. 2. cap. 56. sermonem esse eam Personam cui competit loqui, quæ non nisi Deus loqui potest, & qui locutus est cum Patre, quicquid loquutus est Pater, & in quo, & propter quem, Deus est loquutus, & potenti suo verbo operatur omnia, nominatim cujus alloquentio, sponcione, intercessione, electi vivificantur & sustentantur. *Coc. Prin.*

† It is plain, that *Plato*, and other *Grecians*, borrowed the Term λόγος from the *Jews*, or their Neighbours the *Phenicians* and *Chaldeans*; and that the Apostle *John* did not borrow this Title from the *Grecian Gentiles*. See *Gale's Court of the Gentiles*. P. 2. Book 3. & *Grotius*, in *Joh. 1.*



ingular Number, as it is here and else-
where of the Son, without any Limita-
tion whatsoever *.

Nor doth the Title *God*, either in
his Place, or in the Scripture Notion
of the Word, imply Dominion only;
seeing the Apostle rejects them as no
the Gods, who are not Gods by Nature (a.) (a) Gal. 4.
We must conceive, that to make up the
true Scripture Notion of the Word *God*,
there must not only be Dominion, but
the Divine Nature, and all the Divine
perfections, as the Foundation of that
Son, Dominion.

To this Purpose, when the Prince of
Tyre pretended to be God, he thought
of something more than mere Domini-
on of Strength, and Power invincible;
and God was pleased to convince him
of his Folly, not by telling him how
great his Dominion was, or how low
his Office, but how weak, frail, and pe-
culiar his Nature was; that he was
Man only, and not God (b.) When the (b) Ezek.
Phœnicians took Paul and Barnabas for
Gods, they answered them, by telling
them, they were weak, frail Men, and
had not a Divine Nature. We cannot
imagine, without the greatest Absurdi-
ty, that the Father commenced God, in
the Scripture Notion of the Word, when

A 2

he

* See Dr. Owen on the *Heb.* i. 1. and Dr. Waterland's
Defence, P. 47. and Dr. Calamy, P. 6. Sermon

he created the Universe, and began to have Dominion over it! In this very Text of Scripture, the Son is said to have been with God (the Father) in the Beginning, *i. e.* before the Creation; as therefore in the Scripture Notion of this *Term*, the Father was God in the Beginning, (*that is*, before the Creation) and consequently before he had any Relation to Creatures, or Dominion over them: So the Son, who was in the Beginning, before all Time, who was with the Father in the Beginning, and who was God in the Beginning, *i. e.* before the Creation, was therefore God, in the proper Scripture Notion of the Word, before he had any Relation to Creatures, or Dominion over them.

THIS Verse, *John* 1. 1. contains three Propositions, in each of which the *Word* is the Subject. In the Second of these it is affirmed, That the *Word* was with God, *i. e.* The Son was with the Father in the Beginning. If he were not always with him, and inseparable from him, he could not be God in a *proper* Sense. Some have alledged, That in the Word *God*, when affirmed of the Son in the third Proposition, be taken in the absolute, supreme and proper Sense of the Word *God*, in the same Manner as it is meant of the Father in the second Proposition, that then the Son would be meant to be with *Himself*. But

it is replied, That the Term *God* is taken *personally*, when meant of the Father in the Second, and is to be taken essentially, when affirmed of the Son in the Third Proposition. 'Tis true, God the Son, with God the Father, supposes two Persons truly distinct, but not two Gods, one Supreme and the other Inferior. And altho' the Article prefix'd before $\Theta\epsilon\omicron$, in the Second Proposition, is not prefixed before $\Theta\epsilon\omicron$ in the Third Proposition; yet this doth not in the least intimate, That the Word *God* is not to be taken in the self-same, absolute and supreme Sense, in both Propositions. For it is undeniable, That the Word *God*, Verse 18. of this Chapter, is taken in the proper and supreme sense of the Word, and yet there is no Article prefixed.

THIS Criticism about the prefixed Article was first the Observation of *Asterius the Arian**; which further appears to be void of all Foundation, if we consider, that where the true supreme God is professedly opposed to false Gods, even there he is stiled $\Theta\epsilon\omicron$ without any Article prefix'd; (a) and where the Father is distinguished from the Son, he is called simply $\Theta\epsilon\omicron$ (b.) And further, the Name of God, invested with an Article, is elsewhere in the

A 3

Scriptures

* *Athanas. orat. 2. cont. Arianos.*

(a) Gal. 4.
3, 9.

(b) Rom.
1. 4.

Scriptures * attributed to our Saviour, for he is called *Immanuel*, which being interpreted, is, *God with us.* (μεθ' ἡμῶν)

(a.) Matth.
1. 23.

ὁ Θεός) (a.)

AND *Thomas*, making a Confession of his Faith, which our Lord, in a particular Manner, approved of, expresseth it thus, *Thou art my Lord, thou art my God* (b.) ὁ Κύριός μου, καὶ ὁ Θεός μου †.

(b.) John
20. 28.

BUT that notwithstanding the Cavils of Adversaries, the Word *God*, when affirmed of the Son in the Third Proposition, is to be taken in the absolute, supreme and proper Sense of the Word, in the same Manner as it is meant of the Father in the Second Proposition, will appear with a convincing Evidence, if we take but a passing View of Text and Context; for it is affirmed, That the Word || *was in the Beginning.* That Eternity have no Beginning, and the Sense of these Words cannot be, In the Beginning of Eternity; yet Eternity is before

* The *Ante-Nicene* Writers apply innumerable Texts, Wherein Θεός occurs with the Article, in the LXX, to our Saviour Christ, as doth the Apostle Paul, compare Numbers 21. 5, 6, 7. 1 Cor. 10. 9. Isa. 45. 22, 23. Rom. 14. 11. Philip. 2. 10. Vid. *Surenhusii* Concil. P. 516. and Dr. *Pearson* on the Creed, P. 131.

† There is in the Words an Ellipsis of αὐτοῦ. But enough of this. The *Greeks* promiscuously use or omit the Articles, whereof Examples are innumerable.

|| Sic enim loquitur *Euseb.* Tom. 1. P. 501. Εὐ-
στ; ἰνquit, hanc tenueris vocem, in principio erat Verbum, nihil mali a malevolis adversariis patieris; si dicat, Si Genitus est, non erat; tu dicas, Erat in principio.

before all Things; and *In the Beginning* is a *Scripture* Description of Eternity, as is manifest from Prov. 8. 23. where *From everlasting*, and *In the Beginning before the Earth was*, are of the same import. And the Apostle, saying, That *In the Beginning the Word was*, doth as evidently express his Eternity, as the *Scripture* doth in those other Phrases, *Before the World was*, or, *Before the Foundation of the World*, which more than once it insists on; and as the Word was in the Beginning, and before the Creation, so it is affirmed, That he was with God, *i. e.* the Father, at the Creation (to whom no Doubt it was that God said, *Let us make Man in our Image, after our Likeness.*) And further it is asserted, That *In the Beginning the Word was God* *. Here, *In the Beginning*, must not be denied to the Third Proposition, because it cannot be denied to the First and Second: Therefore, *In the Beginning, i. e.* Before the Creation, before all Time, when there was nothing but *absolute Eternity, The Word was God*, the same God with whom he was. For we cannot, with any Shew of Reason, either imagine that he was with one God, and was another, because there can be

A 4

no

* Θεός καλεῖται, καὶ Θεός ἐστι καὶ ἐστίν. *Iust. Martyr*, Dial. P. 176.

no more true or supreme Gods than one or conceive, That the Apostle should speak of one kind of Gods in the Second, and of another in the Third Proposition; in the Second, of a God Eternal and Independent; in the Third, of a Made and Depending God; especially considering, that the Eternal God was so constantly among the Jews called *The * Word*, which, we conceive, was the great Reason why the Apostle used this Term.

AND not only is the Son here called (Θ.Θ.) which is sometimes the rendering of *Jehovah*, and therefore is a Word of absolute Signification; but it is said That all Things were made by him who was in the beginning, where we

* Gen. 1. 27. We read, *Et creavit Dominus hominem*. The Jerusalem Targum, *Verbum Domini creavit hominem*. Gen. 3. 8. *Audierunt vocem Domini Dei*; the Chaldaic Paraphrase has it, *Audierunt vocem Verbi Domini Dei*. The which the Chaldaic Paraphrase called *MEMRA*, the Hebrew named *אֵלֶּה*, as appeareth by Philo the Jew, who wrote before the Apostle John, and who attributed the Creation of the World to this *Logos*. See Dr. Allix's Judgment of the ancient Jewish Church, Chap. 1. and Dr. Lightfoot's Harp. of the Evang. and Hor. Heb. locum.

† In principio erat Sermo, in quo principio scilicet Deus fecit cælum & terram. Tertul. advers. Herm. cap. 20. As to the absurd Glosses of the Socinians on the Text, their Pretences of a metaphorical Creation and the Beginning, being the Beginning of the Gospel. See them refuted by Dr. Owen, against Biddel, and others as also the Notion of the Word being an instrumental Cause.

one may observe a manifest Allusion to the
 first Words of *Moses*, *Gen. 1.* it is said,
In the beginning God created Heaven and
the Earth: So here, *In the beginning*
the Word made all Things. And seeing
 he was in the beginning, and before all
 Things, and by his Power gave a Be-
 ing to all Things, we must acknow-
 ledge, that, in the Text, he is affirmed
 to be the true and supreme God, and
 God by Nature; because nothing
 can pre-exist unto all Creatures, but in
 the Nature of God, which is Eternal,
 unless we shall suppose a Creature be-
 fore the Creation of any; and no Being
 can create and give a Being to all
 Things, but the *true and supreme God*,
 who is himself independent and ne-
 cessarily existent. The Creation of all
 Things is an indisputable Mark of the
 true supreme God; the distinguishing
 Character by which he was to be known,
 and for which he was to be revered
 above all Gods (*a.*) and on account of
 which he claims to himself all Homage,
 Worship, and Adoration. It could not
 then, without the greatest Absurdity,
 be supposed, That the Eternal Word,
 who in the Text is said to have been in
 the Beginning, *that is*, before the Cre-
 ation to have been with God (the Fa-
 ther) at the Creation, and to whom, in
 the Context, the Creation of all Things

(*a.*) Jer. 10,
 11. Rev. 1
 4. 10, 11.

* is ascribed, is in the Text denominated God, in an *inferior, relative and figurative* Sense.

WE must therefore conclude, That the Word *God*, when affirmed of the Son in the Third Proposition, is to be taken in the absolute, supreme and proper Sense of the Word, in the same Manner as it is meant of the Father in the Second Proposition, and consequently we are to believe, That our Lord Jesus Christ is the *true and supreme* God, which Proposition we shall endeavour further to establish and illustrate in the Sequel.

* The Primitive Writers frequently give it as their Opinion, That the Apostle *John* his expressly insisting on the Deity of Christ, in the Beginning of his Gospel, was with a View to condemn those who denied it, and ascribed the Creation of the World to another *Demiurge*. Vid. *Irena* ad *hæc*, Lib. 3. cap. 11. *Epiphani*, Lib. 1. Tom. 2, *Theodor. Epitom.* *Hæret.* Lib. 2.

C H A P. II.

*Our Lord JESUS CHRIST called
GOD in the Holy Scriptures.*

THE Divinity of our *Saviour* is inculcated in such Variety of Methods, with that Frequency and Solemnity, throughout the whole Bible, that he who runs may read it. It is very legible in the Books of *Moses*, more clearly revealed in the *Psalms*, and shines with a most convincing Evidence in the Writings of the Prophets; is stamped on every Page of the *Gospels*, and gloriously displayed in the *Epistles*. Not only the miraculous Works of our Saviour, but the most ignominious Parts of his Life, declare his Divinity. As none but God could do such Works of Wonder; so none but God could humble himself as he did. Some ways and Tokens of his Godhead were discoverable even in his most ungodlike appearance, *when wrapt in swaddling clothes, and lying in a Manger*; enough to command the Attendance of the heavenly Host, to excite the Curiosity of the *Eastern Sages*, and make the Shepherds

herds quite the Care of their Flock. Yea, so visible were the Signatures of his Divine Nature, even while hanging on the Cross, crowned with Thorns, and pierced with Nails, that the penitent Thief was prompted thereby to apply to him, as the Lord and Proprietor of these heavenly Mansions he desired an Entrance into. Nor could the Roman Centurion forbear leaving his Testimony behind him, *Truly this was the Son of God.* We are therefore directed by our Lord himself, to *search the Scriptures*, for these are they that testify of him, and from them we deduce this as our first Argument.

I. OUR Lord Jesus Christ, not only in the Text, but frequently in the Scriptures, is called *God*, and that in such a Manner, as by that Name no other can be understood, but the *One, Eternal, True, and Supreme God*; and therefore he must be acknowledged as such.

THE most distinguishing Divine Names and Titles are given to him. He is stiled, *The Most High, The Only Lord God, The Lord of all, The Lord of Glory, Our God and Saviour*; and thus in such a Way, as that the Construction of the Words seems plainly to intimate That Jesus Christ is our God, as well as our Saviour.

Luke 1. 76.

Jude 4.

Acts 10. 36.

1 Cor. 2. 3.

2 Pet. 1. 1.

He is *Alpha* and *Omega*, the Beginning Rev. 1. 8. and the Ending *, and this Title five Times given by the Apostle *John* in the *Revelation*; and this is a proper Title of God, and incommunicable to any other. Now, this is ascribed to Christ, without any Restriction or Limitation; so that he is as truly the *First and Last*, even as the Father himself.

SUCH Titles as these, are evidently much too high, and tend to delude and impose upon us, if the Son were not true and Real God, and by Nature such. FURTHER, It is Christ the Son that is spoken to, or denoted by that Name *Elohim*, O God (a), *Psal. 45. 6.* as be- (a) i omi; g the True God by Nature, tho' what LXX. here affirmed be not as God, but as King of his Church and People, as in another Place, God is said to redeem his Church by his own Blood. *Grotius* himself grants, That the Word *Elohim*, used here absolutely, signifieth as much as *Elohe Elohim*, The God of Gods. 'Tis true, he pretends it is not spoken of Christ in this Place; and therefore renders the Words, *God shall be thy Seal or Throne for ever.* But, in this Instance, we have Light enough to rebuke the boldness of this Attempt; for the Interpretation of *Grotius*, or others, is contrary

* Vid. *Placcius Disput. de Christi Divin. Pars 1. P. 387.*

trary to all old Translations; contrary to the received Sense of *Jews* and *Christians* of old, and particularly of the *Targum* on the *Psalms*, rendring the Words, *Thy Throne, O God, is in Heaven for ever*; contrary to the Contexture and Design of the Apostle *Paul* in his Discourse, *Heb. 1.* applying this Text to the Son; and leaves no tolerable Sense to the Words themselves, as appears from this, That these, who embrace this Interpretation, cannot declare in what Sense God is the Throne of Christ. The Words (*shall establish*) make a new Text, or lead the old utterly from the Intention of the Words, and is contrary to the constant Use of the Expression in Scripture; for wherever there is Mention of *the Throne of Christ*, somewhat else, and not God, is intended thereby.

1 John 5.
20.

THE Apostle *John* affirms, That he is the True God; *For we know, saith he, that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an Understanding, that we may know him, that is true---Even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the True God, and Eternal Life.* Tho' it be alledged by Adversaries, That, in Grammatical Construction, these last Words may be applied to the Father; yet a mere Possibility, in respect of the Grammatical Construction, can never, with any Shew of Reason, be pleaded against the glaring

g Evidences from the Context, that these last Words are by the Apostle ascribed to the Son. Jesus Christ is the immediate Antecedent, to which the relative may most properly be referred; the Son of God is he of whom the Apostle chiefly speaketh; this is rendered as a Reason why we are in him that True, by being in his Son, *to wit*, because that Son is the true God; and the Language of the Apostle *John*, the constant Title of our Saviour, is eternal Life; in fine, since all these Reasons may be drawn out of the Text itself, why the Title of the true God should be attributed to the Son, and no reason can be raised from thence why it should be referred to the Father; we must be convinced that our Lord Jesus Christ is in this Place called the true God. *

He is styl'd the *Mighty God*, and *Isa. 9. 6.*
God manifested in the Flesh, 1 Tim. 3.
 6. Where the Name of God absolutely taken, and placed subjectively, is to be understood of Christ, in the six Propositions delivered by the Apostle in that Text; because of him each one is true, and also of none but him. He was the Word which was God, and was made

* Vide, This Text vindicated by D. Calamy Serm. P. 58, &c. Hic agitur non solum de vero Deo, sed illo vero Deo, ut articulus in Græco additus indicat. Carech. Rev.

made Flesh, upon him the Spirit descended at his Baptism, and after his Ascension descended upon his Apostles ratifying his Commission, and confirming the Doctrine they received from him: Wherefore he was *God justified by the Spirit*. His Nativity the Angels celebrated, in the Discharge of his Office they ministred unto him, at his Resurrection and Ascension they were present, always ready to confess and adore him: He was therefore God seen of Angels. The Apostles preached unto all Nations, and he whom they preached was Jesus Christ: He was therefore *God preached unto the Gentiles*. It was John Baptist's Commission, and of all succeeding Ministers to speak to the People, that they should believe on him: He was therefore *God believed on in the World*. When he had been forty Days on Earth after his Resurrection, he was taken visibly up into Heaven, and sat down at the right Hand of the Father: Wherefore he was *God received up in Glory* *.

* Θεός ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί, ταύτην ἡ διδαχὴν ἔχοντες. Chrysost. in locum. Τίς ὁ ἐν σαρκί φανερωθείς; ὁ Ἰησοῦς πάντῃ καὶ πάντως ὁ ἐκ Θεοῦ πατρός λαγός ὡς τοῦτο μέγα τοῦ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστηρίου. Θεός ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί. Cyril. Epist. ad Pulcher. & End. So also Theodoret. 'Tis a groundless Pretence, that Θεός was interpolated by the Nestorians, for so they had overthrown their own Doctrine, and the Catholick Greeks read it Θεός before the Time of Nestorius, so Chrysost. &c. So the Greek Copies, and so the Arabick,

THE Son was in the Form of God, and Phil. 2. 7

at so as to be *equal with God*, before
 taking upon him *the Form of a Ser-*
vant. And his being in *the Form of God*,
 estimates his as fully partaking of the
 divine Nature, as his being in the Form
 of a *Servant*, does his partaking of the
 human Nature. And it is declared,
 that his being thus *equal with God*, was
 that *he thought no Robbery*. * He had
 unquestionable, indisputable Right to
 'Tis the highest Injustice to call it
 question. He is said to be *Immanuel*,
 God with us. And he is stiled *the great*
and our Saviour. And as he that is
 our Saviour is *the great God*, he cannot
 certainly be an Inferiour, a Subordinate
 God †.

B

THE

Esse autem in forma Dei, non aliis intelligentia est, quam
 Dei manere natura. Hilari. De Trinit. L. 12. Parta
 Tertul. Esse se aequalem Deo. Cyprian. 100v & 102
 indifferently used by the Greeks, as Pindarus Olymp
 2. Qui unus locus si velle expendatur, ad omnes hat for
 versus Jesu Christi Domini nostri personam rep lenda. Jus
 Bishop Bull D. P. N. on the Text. Tho' Απταγ
 ηνισθη, may signify to autogate or assume, yet
 αμυμυ ηνισθη, will not admit such a Sense, acc
 ording to the Genius of the *reek Tongue*, if rightly
 dered, he thought it no *Robbery*. Thus Paulinus De
 innate, expresses his Meaning of this Text, Si vere
 no est Christus, cum formam servi accipit, vere quoq
 us est, cum in forma Dei esse perhibetur, nec alia ratione
 ualem diceret, nisi in forma Dei esse verum Deum voluisset
 illigi.

† D. Clark owns, that the Words Tit. 2. 13. will bear
 is Construction. This Expression, the Great God, is
 Clemens of Alexandria understood of God the Son &
 long,

THE Apostle Paul speaking to the Church of *Ephesus*, saith, Take heed to yourselves, and to all the Flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you Overseers, to feed the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own Blood. These Words clearly contain this Proposition, God hath purchased the Church with his own Blood: This *God* may, and must be understood of Christ; it may, because he hath; it must, because no other Person, which is called God, hath so purchased the Church.

THIS Expression cannot be attributed to the Father, because this Blood signifieth Death; and tho' the Father be Omnipotent, and can do all Things, yet he cannot die. Besides, it is very observable, that this particular Phrase *his own Blood*, is in the Scripture put by Way of Opposition to the Blood of another; tho' any should say, the Father hath purchased us, because he gave his Son to be a Ransom for us; yet none can say, that he did it by *his own Blood*. Because we must acknowledge, that the Blood and Death was of another, than

alone, *Protrep. ad Gent. P. 3.* As also by *Gregor. Nyssene Cont. Eunom. P. 265.* and upon Occasion of his applying this Text to Christ, Father *Simon* freely owns *Histoire Orig. des Comment. du N. T. P. 235.* that this is one of the plainest Texts we have, to prove the Divinity of Jesus Christ.

the Father. Thus in this Text, the name of *God*, which, in this Place, is taken *absolutely*, and placed *subjectively*, ascribed to our Lord Jesus Christ.

'Tis declared, as to *John the Baptist*, that *many of the Children of Israel should turn to the Lord their God.* And D.

Luke 1. 16.

mark himself owns, * That this, in strictness of Construction, must necessarily be understood of Christ. And all

the Fulness of the Godhead is said to have dwelt in him Bodily. Where the

Col. 2. 9.

apostle speaks not of Christ's Doctrine; but of his Person. And he does not say,

that God was in Christ, or did abide or dwell in him, as he was said to do in

John, and in the Saints; but that *all the fulness of the Godhead dwelt in him Bodily*;

which was never said of any other. And this Godhead cannot but signify the Divine Nature and Essence.

He is stiled *Lord of Lords*, which is

Rev. 19. 16.

a Title peculiar to the great *Jehovah*, the only true God, and of the same high

signification with that of *God of Gods*;

Isa. 10. 17. *The Lord your God, is Lord of Gods and Lord of Lords, a great*

and mighty and terrible, &c. and in the New Testament the great God is like-

wise described, as *the blessed and only*

1 Tim. 6. 15.

potentate, King of Kings, and Lord of Lords.

B 2 † He

Rom. 9. 5.

ἐπὶ πάντων
not in omni-
bus as Eras.
nor super
omnes, but
super omnia,
as the An-
cients and
the Vul. T.

Isa. 45. 5.

Isa. 44. 8.

Isa. 46. 9.

† HE is declar'd to be *God over all, blessed for ever*, this Character here ascribed to Christ, is given to the *High God*, as distinguish'd from all *Creatures whatsoever*, Rom. 1. 25. where the Apostle charges the Gentiles with *worshipping and serving the Creature more than, (or beside) the Creator*; *this is God blessed for evermore, Amen.* The *Creatures* the Gentiles served were *Demons* and such deceased *Heroes*, as they supposed to be *subordinate Powers*, but raised to the Dignity of Gods; from all these the Apostle distinguishes the true God the *Creator of the World* by the Title, *God blessed for evermore*, q. d. That God, to whom alone the Blessing and Adoration of all intelligent *Creatures* is and will be for ever due. The *Polytheism* of the Pagan World is here exposed by the Apostle, representing the Weakness and Folly of any *subordinate Deities* under One as *Supreme*, which the God of *Israel* always disclaim'd; his common Language was this, *I am the Lord, and there is none else. There is no God besides me. Is there a God besides me? yea there is no God I know not any. I am God, and there is none like me: Before me there was no God form'd, neither shall there be after me.* It is therefore the greatest Absurdity and Impiety for any that call themselves

lves Christians, to talk of one God
 at is *Supreme*, and another that is God
 in a subordinate Sense ! 'Tis observ-
 le, that where any Creatures are in
 e New Testament called *Blessed*, the
 ord is not εὐλογητὸς but εὐλογημένῳ.
 or is that Observation of D. *Hammond*
 oundless, (as Monsieur *Le Clerk*
 ould represent it) concerning the or-
 nary Custom of the *Jews* to add to the
 ame of God this Title of † *Blessed for e-*
vermore. And had not the Apostle be-
 eved our Saviour to be the true and
 rome God, he could not have put a
 eater Stumbling-block before the
 ws to harden them in their Infideli-
 than by giving him a Title and Cha-
 racter, which they had always appro-
 iate to the Great *Jehovah*, and which
 ey could not but take for an Ascripti-
 of *Divinity* unto him in the most
 ict and proper Sense. Farther, the
 uthor cannot in this Text be referred
 as *God blessed for ever*, without ma-
 fest Force. And supposing the *Son* to
 referred to, to bring in an Excepti-
 of one above him, when he is ex-
 uly declar'd to be *God over all*, is so
 B 3 plainly

Irenaeus seems to have laid in against the Distinction
 between the Supreme and a subordinate God, when he
 is, that he that has any one above him, and is in the
 wer of another, cannot be said to be God. Adv. Hæres.
 4. Cap. 3.

The Blessed One signified as much in the *Hebrew* Lan-
 guage as the God of *Israel*. hence are so frequent in the
 1st, The blessed One, the infinite blessed One.

plainly calculate to serve an Hypothesis, that it can affect none, that sincerely desire to know *the Truth as it is in Jesus*. I shall only add, that the Addition of *Amen* is no Proof at all of the Words being a formal *Doxology*, and not an *Affertion*; because 'tis elsewhere added upon the Mention of this Title where there is only an *Affertion*, and not a formal *Doxology*. (*Rom. 1. 25.*) It is very manifest from what has been said that our blessed Saviour in the Text * is declar'd to be *God over all blessed forevermore*; as he is elsewhere said to be *Lord over all*, and the Lord by whom are all Things.

Rom. 10.
13. 12, 14.
1 Cor. 8. 6.

AND there being no one Name of God that is more celebrated, or owned to be more incommunicable than that of *Jehovah*, I think it not improper to add, that the Son has that Name also given him, (of which more in its Place.) The Son then being *Jehovah* as well as

Zech. 12.
10.
John 19.
37.
Hof. 1. 7.
Luke 2. 11.

* Cyprian produces this Text. (*Rom. 9. 5.*) to prove *quod Deus Christus*; and reckoneth it among the rest in which he is called expressly God. *Non solum Pater Deus est, sicut etiam omnes Hæretici concedunt, sed etiam Filius quod, velint nolint, coguntur fateri, dicente Apostolo, qui super omnia Deus benedictus in sæcula.* Aug. de Trin. L. 1. C. 13. Novat de Trinit. useth the same Argument, as doth Tertul. Adver. Prax. and Origen. ad Rom. 9. 5. Athanas. Orat. 4. C. Ar. Hilar. Lib. 4. And this Text is quoted in Proof of the eternal Deity of the Son, in the first Council at Antioch against Paul of Samosatum. That the Word God was originally in this Text, is certain from the ancient Writers, and from what D. Mill has advanced. And from Euseb. H. E. L. 8. C. 11.

the Father, must be true and Supreme
 God as well as he. At which we have
 not the least Occasion to be surpriz'd,
 since *he and the Father are One* : That is
 the God. So One, as that *the Son is in the*
Father, and the Father in the Son, and
 they are represented as *one Temple*, and
 having but *one Throne*, and as making
 the Light.

Joh. 10. 30.
 John 14. 10.
 Rev. 21. 22.
 Rev. 22. 1.
 Rev. 21. 23.

C H A P. III.

Our Lord JESUS CHRIST the Only
 True GOD.

It has been well observed*, That it is
 absolutely necessary to believe the
 Proper Divinity of the Son of God,
 in order to form right Apprehensions of
 the ineffable Love of God the Father,
 giving his Son ; and of the Love of
 the Son, in undertaking the great Work
 of our Redemption ; which is magni-
 fied in Scripture to such a superlative
 degree, as is not to be reconciled to
 the Love of a Being less than truly
 divine.

AMONG other Things that Mr. Sim-
 has taught, to subvert the Mystery
 of

(a) John
17. 3.

of God's Grace and Love manifested in the Gospel, and the *Proper Supreme Deity* of Christ, the Basis of the whole, has been found, by the venerable Assembly, That the Professor hath vented or taught, That the Title of the *Only True God* (a) may be taken, and, by some Authors, is taken in a Sense that includes the personal Property of the Father, and so not belonging to the Son *.

It has been made very manifest, by learned Writers † on this Subject, That the Son is called; and therefore is the *True God*; (1 John 5. 20. ὁ ἀληθινὸς Θεός) and if truly so, then he is the *Only True God* ||, because there is but *One, The Only Living and True God*. *God* is not only *One*, but hath an Unity peculiar to himself, by which he is only *God*, and not only by way of Actuality, but also of Possibility. It having been proved, That Worship, due only to God, is given to him; and that the Names, peculiar to the *One God*, are ascribed to him in Scripture; it is very evident, That he is the *Only True God*.

I. But more particularly, the *True and Proper Deity* of Christ is plainly taught in the holy Scriptures. In them the Works, peculiar to the *Only True God*,

* Proceed. Ass 17. 3. P. 41.

† Dr. Calamy on the Text. B. Pearson, Dr. Owen, Catch. Rev. above cited.

God, are ascribed to him. Our *Jesus* brought out the Redemption of his People, which was a Work infinitely greater than what all the Creatures could have done. Hence, in *Isaiab's* Prophecies, and elsewhere, he that styles himself the Redeemer, declares that he is the Only Infinite *Jehovah*. However, some pretend, That God may accept of a Satisfaction for Sin, of greater or less Value as he thinketh fit. We must look on this as a vain Pretence, seeing God hath made no such Declaration in his Word; on the contrary, *God*, (the Son) is said, to *purchase the Church with his own Blood*. And as nothing greater could be offered to God the Father, than the Blood of his only begotten Son; so we may reasonably suppose, That nothing less could be accepted, either in respect of Sin, for which, or an offended God, to whom this Sacrifice was made; the one being of infinite Demerit, the other of infinite Dignity, and both inferring the Necessity of a suitable Satisfaction. Further, the Scriptures set forth God's *Holiness and Vindictive Justice as Essential**, and therefore necessary Excellencies and Perfections of his Nature. They set forth Christ, in *himself*, as a sufficient Atonement or Propitiation for the Sins of an Elect World. Our Salvation,

Isa. 41. 14.
& 44. 6, 24.
Jer. 50. 34.
Psal. 19. 14.
Hos. 1. 7.
Acts 20. 28.

* Vid. *Owen Dial. de Just. Vind.*

vation, throughout the whole *New Testament*, is ascribed to his Merits and Satisfaction, to the Virtue and Efficacy of his precious Blood. But how could this be, if there were no Merit in his Blood? and Merit there could be none, were it not the Blood of One, who is *truly* God, as well as Man. Seeing there can be nothing more repugnant to Scripture and Reason, than to imagine it possible for a Creature to merit of God; for *who hath first given to him, and it shall be recompensed to him again? Shall the Thing formed say to its Former, Thou art my Debtor, pay me that thou owest?* Every Creature derives, as his Being, so his Worth and Power, from God; and no Creature can possibly advance so near his Creator, but that there will still be an infinite Distance between them; and yet the nearer he approaches, the less able will he be to plead any Merit, since his own Obligations to Gratitude and Obedience must rise in Proportion to the Degrees of Excellencies he has received.

He is said to create all Things; a Work peculiar to the *Only True God, who stretcheth forth the Heavens alone, and by himself*. When it is said, That God made the World by Christ, (*Heb. i. 2.*) the Preposition *διὰ* (signifying *by or through*) points out the Order of Working amongst the Persons of the

Glorious

glorious Trinity. The Father, through the Son, by the Holy Spirit, is said to produce the Work; yet all are the same One Principal Efficient Cause.

HE wrought Miracles by his own proper Power, both in his own Person, and by his Disciples and Apostles; and none but the Only True God can Work proper Miracle.

AGAIN, Christ works Regeneration and Grace in his People. He forgives sin, and justifies them, sends the Holy Spirit, and sanctifies them.

THE Work of judging the World is committed to him, *That all Men may honour the Son, as they honour the Father.* Through the whole Scripture it is declared, That the Judge of the World is the Supreme Being, the Only True God, And none but the Omniscient Almighty *Jehovah*, can accomplish that glorious and solemn Work.

IN FINE, Our Lord Jesus Christ not only quickens dead Souls, in the Ministry of the Gospel, and will raise dead Bodies at the last Day; But he raised himself from the dead, by his own Power. He says, *No Man taketh my Life from me, I have Power to lay it down, and I have Power to take it again.* intimating, in the strongest Terms, That this Almighty Power was inherent in him; and that he would exert this Power, he plainly tells, *Destroy this Temple,*

Matth. 9. 6.

Eph. 5. 26.

Heb. 2. 11.

John 15.

26.

Gen. 18. 25.

Rom. 3. 6.

Psal. 50.

Psal. 96.

Rev. 2. 17.

2 Thess.

2. 8.

John 10. 18.

John 2. 19.

31.

Temple, and in three Days I will raise it up. Than which there could not be a more convincing Proof given of the Truth of his Doctrine, and particularly of this fundamental Article of our Faith, That our Lord Jesus Christ is the Only * True God.

THE Socinians contend, That God the Father *only* raised Christ to Life, and that he himself did only lift and raise his Body out of the Grave. But this Answer is a mere Shift; for, according to this Sense of the Words, all the Dead might be said to raise themselves at the last Day: But, to raise a Body which is dead, is, in the Language of the Scriptures, to give Life unto it, which is no less an Argument of Omnipotence, and therefore of True Deity, than, by Creation, to make that *Something* which before was *Nothing*.

II. THE Attributes which belong to the Only True God, and are therefore undoubtedly infinite, belong to the Son, and are ascribed to him in Scripture; from whence it follows, That he is the *Only True God*.

IT

* Καὶ ἀνέβη ἐκ τῆς γῆς. ὡς καὶ ἀνέβη ἀνεγέρων ἑαυτὸν. Ignat. ad Smyrn. Non enim Pater solus Filium suscitavit, de quo dictum est ab Apostolo, propter quod Deus cum carnalis, sed etiam Dominus seipsum, id est, Corpus suum: Unde dicit, Solvite Templum hoc, & in triduo superstruam illud. Aug. de Verb. Domini. Serm. 2. Vid. Divine on the Resurrection,

It shall be shewn by and by, That our Lord Jesus Christ is absolutely Eternal, Self-Existent, and Necessarily Existent; all which demonstrate his *Proper and True Deity*.

OMNISCIENCE is most certainly an incommunicable Attribute of God. For who, but God, can know all Things? Now, this belongs to our Blessed Saviour, who *knew all Men*, and what was John 2. 24, 25. in Man; the Apostle *Peter* applying to him directly, saith, without any Figure in the Words, *Lord, thou knowest all Things* *. It deserves our Observation, That either that Saying was strictly true, or it was directly blasphemous.

THE latter cannot be imagined, else our Lord had signified his Abhorrence in such Case, had he been aware, That he had attributed to him somewhat that is peculiar to God, if it had not truly belonged to him.

NOTHING can be more peculiar to God, than the knowing all Things, even the Hearts of Men. *Thou, even thou only* (says *Salomon*,) *knowest the Hearts of all the Children of Men*. This Knowledge is affirmed to belong to him by the Apostle *John*, with the outmost Emphasis; for, in his *Revelation*, we have this remarkable Passage, and all the Churches

Comp.
Jer. 17. 10.
with Rev.
2. 23.

*Churches shall know, that I am he which searcheth the Reins and Hearts **.

Matth. 11. 27. John 10, 15. *He knows the Father, which is more than to know all other Things; Neither knoweth any Man the Father, but the Son. As the Father knows me, even so know I the Father.* Our Lords Omniscience is manifestly asserted in the Scripture, in the very same Terms in which that of the only true God is described.

SOME talk in new Terms of a relative Omniscience. Were it not better to say plainly, that he, (Christ,) is not Omniscient, than to speak of a relative Omniscience, which is really no Omniscience, unless an Angel, or a Man be Omniscient, because he knows all Things which he knows? *Matth. 24. 36. and Mark 13. 32.* is plainly meant only of the human Nature, and is to the same Effect with *Luke 2. 52. That he increased in Wisdom,* which cannot be literally understood of the *λογος* with any Consistency, even upon the Arian Hypothesis. As to the Son's not knowing the Day of the last Judgment, D. Lightfoot † his Explanation deserves to be remarked. " 'Tis one Thing, (says " he) to understand the Son of God " barely and abstractly for the second " Person in the holy Trinity; and another " ther

* Ουδεν λαμβανει τον Κυριον αλλα τα κρυπτα κηρυσσει αυτω εστι. Ignat. Epist. ad Ephes.

† Vide D. Lightfoot's Works, Vol. 2. P. 351.

ther to understand him for the *Messias*, or that second Person incarnate. To say, the second Person of the Trinity knows not something, is Blasphe-
 mous; to say so of the *Messias*, is not so, who nevertheless was the same with the second Person of the Trinity. For altho' the second Person abstractly considered according to his mere Deity, was Co-equal with the *Father*, Co-omnipotent, Co-omniscient, Co-eternal with him, &c. yet *Messias*, who was God-man, considered as *Messias*, was a Servant and Messenger of the *Father*, &c."

To this objected Text Hilary * re-
 turns this Answer, that, as it was after the Infirmary of his Flesh, that he, (our Lord) was under Necessity of enduring Weeping, Sleep, Want, Weariness and Fear; so also was it according to his human Nature, that he professed Ignorance of that Day and Hour.

OUR Lord, partaking of a double nature, had a double Understanding; the one Infinite, the other Finite; the one Omniscient, and the other capable of Ignorance in some Things; in the one he differs not from the *Father*, tho' he does in the other. When therefore he is said to know all Things, we are to take it as meant of his Divine Understanding;

* Hilary. Lib. 9. de Trinit. with him agree Chrysost. A.
 n. Theodor. & Greg. Nazi.

standing, and when his *knowing* any Thing is denied, we are to take it meant of his *Human Understanding*. And that this was our Saviour's true Meaning, in the Text referred to, is plain if we consider, that he speaks of himself as he differed from the Father, and had an Understanding that was separate from his, which was only as he was Man. And that his denying his knowing the precise Day and Hour of the last Judgment in that Capacity, was sufficient to check the Curiosity of the Apostles, whom it little became to desire to know more, than the Son himself knew, as he was Man.

Immenfity is another Attribute peculiar to the only true God, he is said, *to fill Heaven and Earth*. In like Manner, our Lord saith of himself, *No Man hath ascended up to Heaven, but he that came down from Heaven, even the Son of Man which is in Heaven*; and so in other Places, he affirms his being in Heaven, at the same Time when he was upon the Earth, whereby he declares the Immenfity of his Nature *. He promised to be with his Servants at all Times, (all Days) to the End of the World; particularly to be in the midst of their religious Assemblies throughout the whole

Matth. 28.
20.
Matth. 16.
20.
Rom. 8. 7.
1 Cor. 1. 3.
2 Cor. 1. 2.

* Si homo tantummodo Christus, quomodo adest ubi que invocatus, cum hac hominis natura non sit, sed Dei. Novat. cit. a Bull.

whole Earth, where he is worshipped
by his People, who pray to him, as
well as the Father, for Grace, Mercy
and Peace; a convincing Argument
of his *Omniscience* and *Omnipre-*
sence, since none can lawfully pray to
any One, but upon this firm Persuasion,
that the Person he prays to, is every
where present, and knoweth all Things;
which the Church, *his Body*, may law-
fully do, seeing *he filleth all in all*.

Eph. i. 23.

INFINITE and essential Holiness is
Characteristick of the *only true God*,
who is said to be *glorious in Holiness*,
his Attribute, as it were, is the Glory
and Refulgency of all his other Excel-
lencies. In a suitableness to this, when
the *Seraphims* beheld the infallible Glo-
ry of Christ, they celebrated this Per-
fection of his *Holiness*, covering their Fa-
ces and their Feet with their wings, (in
sense of their Creature-distance, and
being unable to bear the dazzling
rays of Divine Glory) *one cried to a-*
nother, and said, Holy, Holy, Holy is the
Lord of Hosts, the whole Earth is full of
Glory *.

Exod. 133
11.Isa. 6. 3
John 1. 14

ANOTHER Attribute proper to God,
is *Unchangeableness*, *I am the Lord, I*
change not, which is ascribed to our Lord
Jesus by the Apostle; *They shall perish,*
thou remainest. They shall be changed;
thou art the same, and thy Years shall

Mal. 3.
Plal 103
27.

Heb. 1. 12

C

not fail. And, *He is the same Yesterday, to Day, and for ever.* And tho' the Doctrine of Christ once taught by the Apostles ought to be preserved unchanged, which D. Clark represents to be the Meaning of the last cited Text; and we wish that he and others had shown a greater Regard to such a Sense of the Words; yet it is plain, the Text doth refer rather to the Dignity of Christ's Person, than the Stability of his Doctrine, and is designed to represent as a great Duty constantly to adhere to *Jesus Christ*, who is not a mutable Being, capable of failing, or disappointing the Expectations of his Servants, but is the same Eternally and Unalterably.

Job 11. 7. *THE only true God is Incomprehensible by all finite Minds; for Who by searching can find out God, even the Almighty to Perfection?* So, our Lord Jesus, his Name is Ineffable, his Nature Unsearchable by all created Beings.

Judg. 13. 18. *And the Angel of the Lord, (our Jesus, as is plain from the Context,) said unto him, why askest thou thus after my Name, seeing it is secret? i. e. Hidden from mortal Men, or Wonderful, as the Word signifies, such as thou canst not comprehend: As if he had said, my Nature or Essence, (which is often signified by Name in Scripture) is Incomprehensible. In like Manner, Agur saith of him, What is his Name, and*

what is his Son's Name, if thou canst tell? Prov. 30. 4.
So unsearchable is the Love of Christ,
that it passeth Knowledge. And so in Eph. 3. 19,
comprehensible is he himself, that no Man knoweth the Son but the Father, Matth. 11. 27.

Omnipotence is another distinguishing Character of the only True God. He is the Lord God Almighty; in the same 2 Cor. 6. 18.
Terms it is asserted that our Lord Jesus is the Mighty God, and the Almighty, (ὁ παντοκράτωρ.) Nothing more certain (saith the learned D. Water- and) than that very Text Rev. 1. 8. was understood by the Ante-Nicene Writers in general of God the Son *. His Omnipotency, as it is in thir and other places plainly declared; so it hath been manifested in his creating, upholding, and governing the World; In redeeming his People by his Merit, in renewing and sanctifying them by his Spirit; in the Miracles he wrought in his Life, and in raising himself from the Dead.

It is very manifest, That our Jesus is the only True God: And that therefore the Title of the only True God doth agree to him, and cannot be taken in a sense, that includes the Father's personal Property, no more than the Title of the One Lord can be taken for the personal

C 2

sonal

* B. Bull Animad. on G. Clark. I answer Tertullian calls him by that Name (of God Almighty) in that very Place, against Praxeas. C. 17. Vide Hippolyt. Nr. Noët. C. 6. Alaban. P. 554. Greg. Naz. Orat. 33. a War. P. 451.

sonal Property of the Son; and therefore not applicable to the Father *. The Father (*John* 17. 3.) is not called *the only True God*, in Opposition to the Son, or exclusive of him. It is meant in Opposition to Idols only, as all Antiquity has thought †; and it is manifest from the Context, that the Son is not excluded, but included in the *only True God*: For it is affirmed to be eternal Life to know *Jesus Christ*, (the Son) which could not be, if he were not *truly God*; and if *truly God*, he must be the *only True God*. It is plain from what has been noticed from *Athanasius* in the Margin, that it was not his Opinion, That the Title of the *only True God* is to be taken for the personal Property of the Father. And all that *B. Pearson* says, is, *That the Father is styled the only True God*; but it cannot be supposed that

* Si enim, ut existimant Ariani, Deus Pater solus est Deus, eadem consequentia solus erit Dominus Jesus Christus, & nec Pater erit Dominus, nec Filius Deus. Sed absit. *Hieron. Com. in Ephes. C. 4. V. 5.*

† Igitur ubi Patrem Deum, & solum quidem credimus, opponit simul cum Patre Filium & Spiritum Sanctum attendere, non excludere, quia ad Patrem Filius & Spiritus Sanctus sic pertinent, ut sine illis ne quidem cognoscere possit. Porro volvere id bene attendi Veteres, Patrem unum Deum appellari, non ut Filio, aut Spiritu Sancto opponeretur, sed cuilibet disjuncto Deo, aut Gentilium falsis numinibus, sic *Athanasius Orat. 4. C. An. 4.* Dicit illa, *Deut. 6. 4. John 17. 3.* De unitate solius veri Dei prolata esse, ait, non ad demolitionem illius, qui dicit, ego sum veritas, sed ad ablationem horum qui non sunt veri natura, uti Pater & Filius. *Ath. Cit. a Leyd.*

that he means, that the Son is excluded from that Title, or that it is to be taken for the *Father's* personal Property, because he contends for the *numerical Oneness*, and elsewhere asserts, "That Jesus Christ is the true *Jehovah*, who hath that *Being* which is *Originally* and *Eternally* of *it self* *.

OUR Confession Chap. 8. § 2. asserts, "That the Son is *very* and *eternal* God." And *Larg. Catech. Ans. to Q. 9.* It is said, "There be three Persons in the Godhead, the *Father*, the *Son*, and the *Holy Ghost*, and these Three are *One*, *True*, *eternal* God, the same in Substance, equal in Power and Glory." According to our Standard, the Son is *very* and *eternal* God. The three Persons of the blessed Trinity, are the *One*, *True*, *eternal* God, in Substance the same, in Power and Glory equal, which is the same Thing, as if it had been said, in so many express Words, *The Son is the only True God*,

C 3 CHAP.

C H A P. IV.

*Our Lord JESUS CHRIST Self-
Existent or Independent.*

THE Three Persons of the Adorable Trinity are so distinct, that One of them neither is, nor can be other. Such a Distinction must be allowed, betwixt Father, Son, and Spirit, as may be sufficient to answer the Parts and Purposes that are severally assigned them in the Christian Oeconomy. They have different personal Properties assigned them; different Things are spoken of them; and they are spoken of in a different Order in the Holy Scriptures.

Thus on the Father is distinguished from the Son, and Father and Son are distinct from the Holy Spirit; yet are they not distinguished by any Thing that is proper, peculiar, or essential to the Deity. Tho' they are distinguished one from another by proper Characters; yet are all Essential Attributes and Operations of the Deity common to them all, and the Divine Nature is equal in them all.

As the *Sabellian* Scheme takes away the Deity of the Son, and reduces the Holy Ghost to nothing, making Father and Son not only of one Essence or Substance, but of one *Hypostasis*, with a Nominal Distinction only. Their Trinity was one God, acting in three different dispensations, under the Law, the Gospel, and the Effusion of the Spirit, with Deified Man under the Second. Whoever pretend to own the Deity of the Son and Spirit, but, at the same time, contend for a Superiority, and a greater Excellence in the Father, are really *Arians*, tho' they disown it. This Scheme was brought out of *Platonism* into *Christianity*; and that by which it is distinguished, is, the holding three unequal Persons, One Independent and self-Existent, and the other Two deriving a *Dependent Existence* from the First; which, in the Issue, is no more than one God, and Two Excellent Creatures. The Orthodox distinguish betwixt Essential and Personal *Aseity*. They ascribe the Essential *Aseity* to the Son and Spirit, by which the Deity, communicated to the Son and Spirit, is *a se*; because, if the Deity they possess were not *a se*, it would not be the *True Deity*. They deny the Personal *Aseity*, because, of the Son, as well as the Spirit, be τοθεος, yet not Αυτοπροσωπον.

THE venerable Assembly having considered this Proposition libelled against Mr. *Simson*, viz. *That the Independency of the Deity of our Lord Jesus Christ is a Thing we know not*; they found the Article relevant, but not proven. It being manifest, from what shall be advanced in the Sequel, That Mr. *Simson*, in some Papers under his Hand, given in by him since the Assembly 1727, judged in the Proof the foresaid Article, hath attacked and impugned the *Independence and Self-Existence* of our Lord Jesus Christ; and it being the Design of this Essay, to vindicate the Honour, and assert the *True and Supreme Deity* of our Blessed Saviour; it will not, I hope, be misconstrued, if I consider a little, in what Terms he hath delivered himself upon this Subject.

MR. *Simson* (*Proceed. Ass. 1728. P. 40.*) expresseth himself thus. "Our late *English* Writers, who write best against Atheists, they prove against them the very Thing which the Scripture and our *Confession* call the *Personal Property* of the Father, viz. That there must be, or necessarily exist, some first Principal or Origin of all other Persons or Things, which is absolutely of *None*, or *Unoriginated*, which Scripture, and our *Confession*, declare

declare plainly to be the *Personal Property* of the Father." He adds: "They (who handle the Argument against the Atheists, from the Principles of natural Religion) are far enough from calling it the *Personal Property* of the Father, or from speaking, in these *Dissertations*, of a *Plurality of Divine Persons*—yet they prove against them the very Thing which the *Scripture*, and our *Confession*, calls the *Personal Property* of the Father." It, in my humble Opinion, if they prove against them the very Thing, it amounts to nothing to the Purpose, whether they call it the *Personal Property* of the Father, or not. And it is much to our present purpose to remark, That the very Thing they prove against *Atheists*, from the Principles of *Natural Religion*, in Mr. *Amson's* Opinion, is the *Personal Property* of the Father.

FARTHER, he says, (with a View to suppose, to smoothe the Matter as far as he can) "That they (these Authors) lay aside the Use of the Word *Cause* in its ordinary Meaning."

THE main Point of Infidelity among Atheists, is their denying the Being of God. These who write against them prove, That there must needs be some first Principle or Origin of all other Persons or Things whatsoever, which is absolutely of none, i. e. That derives Being from

from no other Being, or prior Cause and which is the first Cause and Fountain of all Being: And seeing this is both a good and common Argument well improved by these that write against Atheists, demonstrating the Being of God *a posteriori*, reasoning from the Effects to the First Cause, which must necessarily be Self-Existent; it is not easily to be understood, how, in managing this Argument accurately, they should lay aside the Use of the Word *Cause* in its ordinary Meaning, upon which the Force of their Argument depends, and, at the same Time, fix upon some extraordinary Meaning of the Word *Cause*, which is not demonstrable from the Principles of Natural Religion, and that to little or no Purpose as to the main Design of their Argument; seeing Mr. *Simson* owns, they are far enough from calling it the Father's *Personal Property*, or speaking in these Dissertations, of a Plurality of Divine Persons.

THAT I may not impose a worse Sense upon Mr. *Simson's* Words, than they bear in their native Meaning, it will be fit to consider his Notion of *Person*. (*State, P. 94.*) He says, "The Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are, in our Confession of Faith and Catechisms, called Three Persons, without the least Hint given, That the Word is not to be

be taken in its proper Meaning, in which Sense therefore I must explain it—Especially since the Divine Persons, both in Scripture and our Confession, are as plainly represented to be *Distinct Intelligent Agents*, as they are therein represented to be any Way whatsoever distinguished from one another."

"AND, P. 93. so far as the Defendant can learn, the proper Meaning of the English Word *Person*, is an *Intelligent Agent*, which properly signifies, A living, understanding, active Principle of working or doing, to which any Work or Deed done is ascribed, as to its particular Cause, in which Sense the Word is taken, *Hib. 1. 3.* where it is meant of the Person of the Father, where he is manifestly distinguished from the Person of the Son." From all which it is very plain, That, according to Mr. *Simson*, the Three Persons of the Adorable Trinity, are Three *Proper Persons*, in the proper, i. e. ordinary Meaning of the Word *Person*, among Men *. That a *Proper Person* is an *Intelligent Agent*, or a living

* *State*, P. 115. Wit. 4. Depones, That, in the said former Years, the *Professor*, when explaining the Term *Person*, gave the following Caution, viz. *Personae non hic sunt eodem sensu ac quando applicantur hominibus, sed seu analogica.* But, in the latter End of the Year 1725. he gave no such Caution, nor since, to his Remembrance, Vid. Wit. 5. and Wit. 15. &c.

a living, understanding, active Principle of working; and that the Person of the Father, as distinguished from the Person of the Son, is such a distinct, living, understanding Principle of working—And that since they are distinct *intelligent Agents*, according to him, the Father is therefore one distinct *intelligent Agent*, and understanding Principle of Operation, and the Son another.

We must here remember, That the venerable Assembly found the Fourth Article of the Libel against Mr. Simonds. His teaching, as his own Opinion. That the Three Persons of the Trinity are not to be said to be *numerically One* in Substance or Essence; both relevant and sufficiently proven.

Those who write best against *Atheists*, who deny the Being of a God, they prove against them, That there must needs be some intelligent Agent or separate Being, which is the First Cause of all other Beings, which is absolutely *Independent* and *Self-Existent*, and upon which all other Beings do depend. This is a *Primary* and *Essential* Attribute and Perfection of the One True God, demonstrable from the Principles of Nature.

* Brown, Wit. 6. deposes the Professor said, That in the Trinity, there are Three *Beings*; and so does Wit. 7. Vid. Wit. 15. If the Quotation, P. 97. be to his Purpose, he seems, by Consequence, to ascribe to the Divine Persons different Understandings and Wills,

al Religion; and yet affirmed by Mr. Simson, to be the *Father's Personal Property*. According to Mr. Simson's own Scheme just now taken Notice of, the *Father* and *Son* are not of one Substance or Number: They are therefore *distinct Substances*. The *Father* an *Unoriginated Substance*, the *Son* an *Originated Substance*. The *Father* one Intelligent Agent, absolutely of *None*, i. e. of no other *Person*, of no other living, understanding Principle of working; the *Son*, another Intelligent Agent *distinct* from the *Father*, is of another *Person*, i. e. the *other*, who is another living, understanding Principle of working, *distinct* from the *Son*.

I leave it to the Reader to judge, if two distinct Intelligent Agents; two distinct, living, understanding Principles of working; two distinct Substances, the one *Originated*, the other *Unoriginated*; be not two separate Beings, and two Persons, in the proper and ordinary Meaning of the Word *Person* among Men, i. e. distinguished by their distinct Substances, and not merely by their Personal Properties.

THAT which is incumbent on me to prove, is, That the *Son* is the same Independent Being and Substance that the *Father* is; That he is *Self-Existent* as well as the *Father*, and has received Being from no other Being or Prior Cause.

THAT

THAT we may give the Meaning that Term *Self-Existence*, when affirm'd of the Son *, as well as of the Father we may only take Notice, That *Existence*, or *Independence*, is an *Essential* and *Primary* Perfection of God, being manifest, That, in the Subordination of Causes, God is the *First Cause* and therefore receives nothing from a *Prior Cause*.

THIS *Primary* Attribute of the Deity we, because of our Weakness, commonly take up by a negative Idea, The God, being the *First Cause*, depends on no other Cause, yet it is in itself a most *Glorious*, *Essential*, and *Positive* Perfection of God, by some called *Assity*, denoting his most perfect Sufficiency to exist of, and from himself; so that from himself (in a negative not positive Meaning) he exists, in a Way most remote from all Causality, and in a Manner infinitely more glorious than all other Beings, who derive their *Being* and *Existence* from their *Cause*. This Perfection has been demonstrated by these that write best on *Natural Religion*, to be an *Essential* and *Primary* Attribute of God. Which therefore belongeth to the † Son, who, according to the whole Strain of Divine Revelation, is the *One True God*. M.

* State, P. 40.

† Filius Dei a se est, hoc est, vivit per suam Omnia sufficientiam. Vitting. Vid. etiam Gamay.

Mr. *Simson* appeals to Bishop *Pearson* and Bishop *Bull*, their Sentiments to the *personal Properties*. But what these learned Authors have advanced on this Subject, we must be convinced that they differ widely from him in this very Head, however sometimes they seem to reason against the *Atheists*. For Bishop *Bull*, as he maintains the eternal necessary Generation of the *Son*, and that both as his Judgment, and that of the *primitive Fathers*; so likewise he asserts the *Consubstantiality*, and his Equality to the *Father* as to *Nature* and *Essence* *. And so doth Bishop *Pearson*, who saith expressly †; "He, (the *Father*) hath begotten a *Son* of the same Nature and Essence with himself, not only specifically, but individually," and where he proves from *John* 1. 1. that "the *Word* is the same *Supreme, Eternal, Independent* ‡ God with the *Father*." We may be satisfactorily fully convinc'd of the *Distinction* between *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghost*, without pretending to assign, or so much as to be able to conceive the particular grounds of that *Distinction*. These are unfolded to us in *Scripture*, and therefore some late Writers have taken

abun-

Bull Imp. Points of Div. Christ. V. 3, P. 244. 2.

B. *Pearson* on the Creed. P. 33.
Ibid. P. 120.

abundantly too much upon them, who tell us they will unravel this great Mystery *. But after all, have left it as much in the Dark as ever. However, we may be assured that *Independence*, an essential Perfection of the *Deity*, can be no distinguishing Character of the *Divine Persons* from one another, who are the same *one True God*. And because the whole *Divine Nature* is in *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*, and in each of them consider'd distinctly.

THE personal Properties of *Father and Son*, revealed to us in Scripture, are, that he begets the *Son*, and the *Son* is begotten of the *Father*. But since the Scriptures in the strongest Terms, assert, That the *Son* is as truly, and in all Respects as much *our One God*, as the *Father* himself, and not inferior to him as *God*: We must believe that the same independent Substance or Essence, subsists in the *unbegotten Father* †, and begotten *Son*. It is most absurd, which some have advanced ‡, That if the Persons of the adorable Trinity, are not proper Persons, in the Sense and Definition of

* Scrip. Trin. explained.

† Christus ad se Deus dicitur, ad Patrem Filius dicitur. Rursusque Pater ad se Deus dicitur, ad Filium Pater. -- quod dicitur ad se Pater, & Filius ad se, eundem Deum. Ergo quum de Filio sine Patris respectu simpliciter loquimur, bene & proprie, ipsum a se esse affirmamus. -- Aug. L. 3. de Trin.

‡ Mr. Watts on the Trine

the Term *Person* among Men, then they are not Persons at all, or not Persons properly, but *Metaphorically*: As if any would say, that the infinite Being is not properly a Being, unless the proper Definition of a finite Being agree to him.

We maintain, that the *Persons* of the blessed *Trinity* are truly distinct, in Opposition to *Sabellianism*: And that they are proper *Persons* subsisting in the same undivided *Substance* or *Essence*: That the *Generation* is a proper *Generation*: That the *Procession* of the *Holy Spirit* a proper *Procession*, such as doth properly, and did eternally and necessarily take place among the glorious *Persons* subsisting in the *Godhead*. But we deny that they are proper *Persons* in the sense that Men and Angels are proper *Persons*; who are distinct *Substances*, and have distinct *Understandings* and *Wills*. The *Persons* of the *Trinity* are not so distinct, as to be independent of, separate from, and Alien to each other. They are distinct proper *Persons*, tho' no Man, nor perhaps Angel can define, what a *Divine Person* is, or account for the Distinction among themselves. The like may be said of the *Generation* of the *Son*, which is no doubt most proper, tho' not to be defin'd by the Notion of *Generation* among Men: For who can declare his *Generation*. And

D

since

abundantly too much upon them, who tell us they will unravel this great Mystery *. But after all, have left it as much in the Dark as ever. However, we may be assured that *Independence*, an essential Perfection of the *Deity*, can be no distinguishing Character of the *Divine Persons* from one another, who are the same *one True God*. And because the whole *Divine Nature* is in *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*, and in each of them consider'd distinctly.

THE personal Properties of *Father and Son*, revealed to us in Scripture, are, that he *begets* the *Son*, and the *Son* is *begotten* of the *Father*. But since the Scriptures in the strongest Terms, assert, That the *Son* is as truly, and in all Respects as much our *One God*, as the *Father* himself, and not inferior to him as *God*: We must believe that the same independent Substance or Essence, subsists in the *unbegotten Father* †, and *begotten Son*. It is most absurd, which some have advanced ‡, That if the Persons of the adorable Trinity, are not proper Persons, in the Sense and Definition of

* *Scrip. Trin.* explained.

† *Christus ad se Deus dicitur, ad Patrem Filium dicitur. Rursusque Pater ad se Deus dicitur, ad Filium Pater. quod dicitur ad se Pater, & Filius ad se, est idem Deus. Ergo quum de Filio sine Patris respectu simpliciter loquimur, bene & proprie, ipsum a se esse affirmamus.* Aug. L. 5. de *Trin.*

‡ *Mr. Watts on the Trin.*

The Term *Person* among Men, then they are not Persons at all, or not Persons properly, but *Metaphorically*: As if any would say, that the infinite Being is not properly a Being, unless the proper Definition of a finite Being agree to him.

We maintain, that the *Persons* of the blessed *Trinity* are truly distinct, in Opposition to *Sabellianism*: And that they are proper *Persons* subsisting in the same undivided *Substance* or *Essence*: That the *Generation* is a proper *Generation*: The *Procession* of the *Holy Spirit* a proper *Procession*, such as doth properly, and did eternally and necessarily take place among the glorious *Persons* subsisting in the *Godhead*. But we deny that they are proper *Persons* in the sense that Men and Angels are proper *Persons*: who are distinct *Substances*, and have distinct *Understandings* and *Wills*. The *Persons* of the *Trinity* are not so distinct, as to be independent of, separate from, and Alien to each other. They are distinct proper *Persons*, tho' no Man, nor perhaps Angel can define, what a *Divine Person* is, or account for the Distinction among themselves. The like may be said of the *Generation* of the *Son*, which is no doubt most proper, tho' not to be defined by the Notion of *Generation* among Men: For who can declare his *Generation*. And

D

since

since the Generation of the *Son* will still remain a *Mystery*, let bold Men quibble as they will. There is no great Force in that Argument D. Clark * advances for the Father's proper Supremacy, viz. *That he that begat, must needs, (for that Reason, and upon that very Account) be greater than he that is begotten of him.* However in the Text adduced there by the Dr., it deserves to be observed, That our Lord is not there speaking of his *Generation*, but his *Mission*, (which may well take Place betwixt two equal Persons) nor does he drop any Thing that intimates any particular Reference to his *Father's* begetting him; but directly refers to his own acting by his Commission as *Mediator*, which is the Respect in which his *Father* is greater. Among Men in the very Name of *Father*, there is imply'd something greater than in that of *Son*. But it does not follow, that it must needs be so in the *Deity*, where the *Son* no more had any Beginning of Being than the Father; nor could in any Instant not have been, any more than the Father himself could not have been. A Parallel between Father and Son amongst Men, and *Father* and *Son* in the *Deity*, can not with any Shew of Reason be drawn, the Difference being so wide between them, as might be shewn in many Particulars.

Among

Among Men, Father and Son are Two, not only divided Persons, but they have different Endowments: In the *Deity* Father and Son are *One*; not *one* Person, but one in all Excellencies and Perfections: Amongst Men the Father has his Things, and the Son his Things; but in the *Deity* the *Son* hath all Things (without Exception) that the *Father* hath. Among Men, the Son doth some Things, and the Father other Things; but in the *Deity*, whatever Things the *Father* doth, these doth the *Son* likewise. Amongst Men, tho' the Son is from the Father, yet he is not in the Father; and tho' the Father produced the Son, yet he is not in the Son; and tho' a Son may be like the Father, yet it can not, speaking strictly, be said, that he that has seen the Son has seen the Father. But in the *Deity*, the *Father* is so in the *Son*, and the *Son* in the *Father*, that he that has seen the *Son*, has also seen the *Father*.

THE Learned D. Calamy* has made it appear, that that Phrase, *The Father is Fountain of the Deity*, as it is not a Scriptural Expression, so it is not a proper Speech, nor strictly justifiable; and that it seems to have been first brought in by the spurious *Denis the Arcopagite*. I could advance a concurring Testimony of judicious Divines on this Head.

D 2

THE

THE same excellent Author, owns himself backward to give in to a proper Supremacy of the Father, for fear of laying a Foundation for an Inference of the Inferiority of the Son ||.

|| D. Calamy's Sermon.
P. 26.

THAT Text *John 5. As the Father hath Life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have Life in himself;* has been adduced to prove a proper Communication of Substance from Father to Son. Calvin and others have answered, that this Text is to be understood of our Lord Jesus as Mediator. But we shall not refuse eagerly a Communication of Substance in the Sense above explained, of a proper Divine Generation; if all that is meant by it, be, that the Father and Son are so truly distinguished by some eternal necessary Relation to one another, that the one can not be the other, tho' the *Modus* of that Relation, that founds the true Distinction, is not revealed, nor can be comprehended, and therefore ought not to be defined by us; we refuse it to be a proper Communication, in the Sense that Father communicates Substance to Son among Men. The Communication must be of the same numerical Substance. The Life given here, is to have Life in himself; and to have Life in himself, even as the Father hath Life in himself, which is therefore an independent Life and Nature. Which independent Life and Nature, (if this Place be rightly understood of the
Gene-

Generation of the Son, which is Eternal) was communicated to the *Son* from all Eternity; the *Father* was * always *Father*; he is as necessarily a *Father*, as he is *God*. The *Character* of *Father* being necessary, and not depending upon his Will, so that the *Son* never began to be, but is, and always was, the *independent God*: And he that is, and from Eternity always was, the *Independent God*, is truly *Self-existent* and *independent*, and received *Being* and *Godhead* from no other *Being* whatsoever. As it is an eternal *relative Perfection* in the *Father* to beget the *Son*, so it is an eternal *relative Perfection* in the *Son* to be begotten of the *Father*. And no Man can prove the one *Perfection* greater than the other; unless he can work out a *Demonstration* without *Ideas* †. The *Fallacy* lies in conceiving the glorious *Persons* of the *Blessed Trinity*, and the eternal *Generation* ‡, after the

D 3 Manner

* Semper enim in Patre, ne Pater non semper sit Pater. Novat. de Trin. C. 21. Πατήρ αὐτὸς Πατήρ, καὶ οὐκ ἦν καὶ ποτὶς ἐν τῷ ὁ Πατήρ Πατήρ. Epiph. Hæres. 62. vid. Cyril. Dial. de Trin. 2.

† Μη — Ne de generatione Dei disputes: Neq; enim illud totum est. Si enim tuam cognoscis non protinus sequitur, Dei quoq; generationem tibi cognitam esse. Si autem tua tibi ignota est, quo tandem modo Dei generatio tibi nota erit? quanto enim difficilius est, Dei naturam, quam hominis indagare, tanto etiam difficilius percipi potest superna & divina generatio quam tua. Nazianz. Orat. 25.

‡ Irenæus, and most of the ancient Writers after him, represent the " Son's Generation as a Thing that is not to be

Manner of human Persons, and of an human *Generation*, and that without any Foundation in Scripture, or solid Argument from *Reason*. Tho' the Generation of the Son is revealed in Scripture; yet it is no where said, that it is to be explained by that among Men, but quite otherwise, as might be shown. And the Scriptures no where assert a proper Supremacy of the *Father* above the Son, except what is merely *Oeconomical*. As for *Reason*, I know little it hath to say here, having got a Bruise in the Fall, it is weak even in its own Sphere: With how much Toil doth it creep from Letters to Words, and from Words to Arts and Sciences? and when it is there, how little doth it know? Can it draw out an occult Quality to open View, or unridle a Load-stone; nay, in a common Stone, can it dive into the Form and Nature of it? Can it strip the meanest Creature of the investing Accidents, and look upon the pure naked Essence thereof? And shall such a Weakling as this, dunced in every Atome within its own Sphere, usurp the Crown, and rule over sacred Mysteries, which come out of the Bosom of God, by divine Revelation,

“ be explain'd, and which no one knows, neither Angels,
 “ nor Arch angels, nor Principalities, nor Powers, but
 “ only the Father that beget, and the Son that is begot-
 “ ten.” *Iren. Adv. Hæc. L. 2. C. 48. Vocatur genera-
 tio, non ut passionem aliquam adumbrant, sed ut essentia identi-
 tatem statuant.* *Ibid. Pelus. Epist. 141.*

lation, to be the Wonder of Angels, and the Object of the Faith of Men, and are in a transcendent Excess, infinitely above the Capacity of both of them. The *Father's Personal Property* is only known by Revelation, and is one of these sacred Mysteries to be adored and believed, and not audaciously searched into. And we must be pardoned to say, That it is a Thing very unintelligible, how the Scripture Notion of the *Father's Personal Property*, *Unbegotten*, and *Begetting the Son*, can, in any Sense whatsoever, so include that Natural and Self-Evident Attribute of the Deity, *Independence* or *Self-Existence*, as, in that Sense, not to be affirmed of the *Son*.

ACCORDING to our *Confession*, Ch. 2. § 2. *God* (essentially considered) is the alone Fountain of all Being. And the *Son*, with the *Holy Ghost*, as well as the *Father*, according to § 3. being *God*, essentially considered, is therefore here asserted, according to the Scripture, to be the *Fountain of all Being*; and therefore an *Independent* and *Undeived Being*, having *Being* and *Godhead* from no other *Being* whatsoever. The *Undeived Self-Existent Essence* and *Being* is one and the same numerically in the Three *Divine Persons*.

To make the *Being* and *Godhead* of the *Son* Derived and Dependent, is to make him another *God*, an *Inferior God*

to the *Father*, and consequently no God, but an Excellent Creature. These who deny the numerical *Oneness* of *Substance* or *Essence*, they class the Glorious Eternal Son of God among the Rank of *Dependent*, and therefore *Contingent* Beings. It is absurd and contradictory to suppose two or more *Independent* Beings or *Substances*: And it is demonstrable, That a *Dependent* Being or *Substance* cannot be the One True God. And upon this we shall found our first Argument from the Holy Scriptures, to prove, That the Son is an *Independent* Being or *Substance*, as well as the *Father*.

I. It appears, from a Variety of Texts in the Scripture, (which can only give us Light in this awful and mysterious Subject) That the Son is as truly and really God, as the *Father* himself. It has been proved, and shall be further illustrated in the Sequel, That the Son, in all Respects, is as much our *One* God as the *Father* himself; and since he is the One God, he is therefore *Independent*, because the One God is necessarily such. For (as the learned Bishop Pearson says) "The first and common
" Notion of a *Divinity* consists in these
" Particulars; That it is a Being of it
" self, and *Independent* from any other;
" That it is that upon which all Things,
" that are made, depend; and That it

" governs

"governs all Things *." Some endeavour to load the Defenders of the *numerical Oneness* with the Calumny of *Sabellianism*. It may be lodged more justly with the Impugners of our Lord's *Supreme Deity*. It is, no Doubt, *Sabellianism*, to say, That there is but one Person who is the *Supreme God, i. e. Truly God*; or to suppose the *Godhead* to be one single *Hypostasis*. It is Blasphemy to say, That the Son is not *Truly God*; and an absurd Contradiction to say, That he is *Truly God*, and yet not Independent, *i. e.* a Dependent God, *that is, a God, and no God.*

II. OUR One God the *Father*, never was any other than a *Father*. He was not first *God*, and afterwards a *Father*; but, without any Beginning of Being, always was both *God* and *Father* †. He is as necessarily a *Father*, as he is *God*; the Character of *Father* depending upon his *Godhead*, and not merely upon his Will. If he had not ever been a *Father*, there must have been an instant when he was without a Son; and then it could not have been said by the Apostle, That the *Word* that was *God, was in the Beginning (i. e. from Eternity) with God.* And since our *One God* the *Father* always was a *Father*,

* B. Pearson, *Expos. of the Creed*, P. 18.

† *Alex. B. of Alexandria*, reckons it among the Singularities of *Arius*, That he would not own the *Father* to have been always a *Father*, *Alex. Epist.*

ther, it follows, by a necessary Consequence, That he always had a Son; and that that Son of his had no Beginning of Being, and could not but be, and exist necessarily; and that it can, with no more Truth, be said of him, That *there was a Time when he was not*, than it can of the *Father* himself. And since the Son had no Beginning of Being, he received *Being* and *Godhead* from no *prior Being*; and since he received Being from no *prior Being*, it must be acknowledged, That he is *independent* and *Self-Existent*. The Son had no Beginning of Being, and is therefore a *Beginningless Being*.

'Tis plain, That God, being always *Father*, and Christ being the *Only Begotten* of the *Father*, he must partake of the *Substance* * of the *Father*; and if he partake of the *Substance* of the *Father*, he must be *One* with the *Father*, because the *Divine Substance* is but *One*, as being *infinite* and *indivisible*; and therefore cannot be separated or multiplied. And since the whole *Divine Essence* is from all *Eternity*, and *Independent*; and the *Generation* of the Son is *absolutely Eternal* †: Therefore our Blessed

* That the Son is of the same *Substance* with the *Father*, see it proven, *Pearse*, on the Creed, P. 107. and *Bull.* D. F. N.

† Quod ante tempus natum est, semper est natum; quia id quod est ante æternum Tempus, hoc semper

Blessed Saviour, by partaking of this Divine Essence, must, for that Reason, be *Eternal and Independent*.

No less a Man than Dr. *Waterland*, who, with great Learning and Skill in the Writings of the Ancients, has defended the proper Deity of our Blessed Saviour with great Applause, blames Dr. *Clark*, for taking Advantage of that equivocal Word ἀγεννητός, which he renders commonly *Self-Existent*, which cannot serve his Cause, since it may well be translated, *Unbegotten* *. For, as that learned Author observes elsewhere, the Word ἀγεννητός and ἀγενής, with double or single ν, have been used very promiscuously in Authors; and hardly came to be accurately distinguished, till the *Arian Controversy* gave Occasion for it †. 'Tis plain, That some of the Ancients, (as *Cyril*, and others) by ἀγεννητός,

Quod autem semper est natum, non admittit, ne aliquando non fuerit; quia aliquando non fuisse, jam non est semper esse, *Hilar. de Trin. P. 1127. Origen, Com in Jo. P. 31.* commenting on these Words, *This Day I have begotten Thee*, proceeds thus, — Αγενηται — They are spoken to him by God, with whom it is always *To day*; for I conceive there is no Evening nor Morning with him; but the Time co-extended, if I may so speak, with his Unbegotten and Eternal Life, is the *To day*, in which the Son is begotten; there being no Beginning found of his Generation, any more than of the *To day*.

* Dr. *Water.* 1 Def. P. 371.

† Ibid. P. 153. Vid. *Snicer. Thesaur.* and *Cudworth*, for Profan. Writ. P. 253. and *Montf. Admon.* in *Athan.* de Cret. *Athan. Syn. N.* P. 207. *Cic. ibid.*

ὤντος, understood *Unbegotten* * ; and that, when by ἀγεννητός, they meant *Being Uncreated, Immutable, Eternal and Independent*, they ascribed the Term to the Son, as well as the Father : So *Ignatius*, so *Irenæus*, so *Origen*, expressly styles him †. Dr. *Waterland* shows, by solid Arguments, That *Irenæus* affirmed the Three Persons to be the One Α'γεννητός Θεός, or Eternal God ‖.

III. OUR Lord Jesus Christ is the Fountain of all Being, who gave Being to every other Being beside himself, and upon whom all Things that are made do depend. Which is manifest from the Holy Scriptures, which ascribe the Creation of all Things unto him, as the Principal Efficient Cause ; which shall be further illustrated in the Sequel. He is therefore the *First Cause*, and derives his Being from no *Prior Cause* ; because it is a gross Absurdity to suppose a Cause before the *First Cause*.

IV. It

* Οὐτὸς δὲ ἀγεννητός, ὅτε δύο μονογενεῖς, ἀλλ' ἓς αὐτὸν Πατὴρ ἀγεννητός (ἀγεννητός γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ Πατήρ μὴ ὄντως) καὶ ἐκ τῆς ἑκείνου, ἀδίδως ἐκ Πατρὸς γεγεννημένος. *Cyrenæus* (cit. a *Wat.*) *Catech.* 10. P. 141. Or.

† Dr. *Wat.* *ibid.* P. 258, 438, 439. where he says That *Origen* expressly makes him (the Son) ἀγεννητός Uncreated, Immutable, &c. and cites his Book against *Celsus*, P. 287, 169, 170. and affirms it to be a known Principle of *Irenæus*, his asserting the Son to be ἀγεννητός and cites *Iren.* lib. 2. cap. 36. P. 163.

‖ Dr. *Wat.* P. 438.

IV. It must be owned by all, That he who is the *First and Last*, and besides whom there is no God, is truly Independent and Self-Existent; because, by these very Characters, the *Only True God*, distinguisheth himself from all false Gods, that have not a Divine Nature.

WHEN we observe, That our Lord Jesus Christ doth assume this Titles to himself absolutely, without any Restriction or Limitation, we must conclude, that he is the *Only True God*, Independent, and Self-Existent. He proclaimed himself by a great Voice, as of a Trumpet, saying, *I am Alpha and Omega, the First and the Last*. He upholdeth the Church of *Smyrna*, in her tribulation, by virtue of the same Description. *These Things saith the First and the Last, which was dead and is alive*. He ascertaineth his Coming to judgment with the same Assertion, *I am Alpha and Omega, the Beginning and the End, the First and the Last*.

He saith likewise of himself, *Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the Ends of the Earth: For I am God, and there is none else. I have sworn by my myself, that unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear*. Here the Son sets himself forth as the Object of the Faith of sinful Men; as the Object of their Worship and Adoration. He swears by himself, because he could swear by none

Isa. 44. 6.

Rev. 1. 17.

Rev. 2. 8.

Rev. 22. 13.

Isa. 45. 22, 23.

Rev. 22. 13. none greater. He asserts himself to be
 God, beside whom there is none else.
 Isa. 44. 6. All which, together with his being the
 * First and the Last, sufficiently de-
 monstrate, *That beside him there is no*
God; and that before him there was no
God formed, neither shall there be after
him. Wherefore, he received Being
 and Godhead from no Prior Being, and
 therefore must be owned to be Inde-
 pendent † and Self-Existent.

V. OUR Lord Jesus Christ is called
Jehovah in many different Places of
 Jer. 23. 5, 6. Scripture. He is the *Righteous Branch*
raised unto David; the King that shall
reign and prosper, in whose Days Judah
shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safe-
ly. We are assured, That *this is the*
Name whereby he shall be called, The
Lord Our Righteousness ||. The Lord, that

* Rev. 22. 13. Εγώ εἰμι τὸ Α καὶ τὸ Ω, ἀρχὴ καὶ
 τέλος. ὁ πρῶτος καὶ ὁ ἔσχατος, with the Article ἐν
 where so much stood upon. It has been a bold and ill-
 founded Criticism of Socinus, and others, That the most
 fundamental Doctrine, maintained as such, ever since the
 Apostles Times, by the Catholick Church, must be ex-
 amined and censured, by δ, ἃ, το. Articles that God
 promiscuously use or omit.

† To talk of one that is Eternal God, deriving from
 another, is to throw out a vile Contradiction, and de-
 riving Deity, or that he, that gives Existence to all
 other Things, should not be Self-Existent, *Bradbury*
Serm. V. 2. P. 758.

|| Jer. 23. 5, 6. The Jews attribute the Name *Jehovah*
 to the *Messias*, from this very Text, as in the *Seder*
ker, lib. 2. cap. 8. The Translation runs thus. *as the*
 * Scripture calleth the Name of the *Messias*, *Jehovah* *Shalom*

to be *Jehovah*. The Expression of his Su-
 else, *Pre-eminence* and *Independent Nature*, and
 g the Addition of *Our Righteousness*, can
 r de be no Diminution to his Majesty.

IF those Words in the Prophet, *Sing* Zech. 2. 10,
 and *rejoyce, O Daughter of Zion, for lo,* 11
I come and will dwell in the Midst of
thee, saith the Lord (Jehovah), did not
 sufficiently, of themselves, denote our
 Saviour, who dwelt among us, as cer-
 tainly they do; yet the Words that fol-
 low would evince as much, *And many*
Nations shall be joyned to the Lord in that
Day, and shall be my People; and I will
dwell in the Midst of thee; and thou shalt
know that the Lord of Hosts hath sent me
unto thee. For what other Lord can we
 conceive dwelling in the Midst of us,
 and sent unto us by the Lord of Hosts,
 but Christ? It was no other than *Jeho-* Hof. 2. 7:
vah that spake these Words, *I will have*
Mercy upon the House of Judah, and will Zech. 10.
have them by the Lord (Jehovah) their 12.
God. As in another Place he speaketh, *Comp. also*
I will strengthen them in the Lord, (Je- Zech. 12.
hovah) and they shall walk up and down 10. John
 19. 34, 36.
 & Isa. 40. 3.
 Matth. 3. 3.
 Deut. 6. 4.

Righteousness. And in Midrash Tishim on Psal. 27.
 God calleth the *Messias* by his own Name, and his
 Name is *Jehovah*. It is written of the *Messias*. Jer.
 23. 6. This is the Name which they shall call him,
Jehovah Our Righteousness. Thus also *Echa Rabbati*,
 Lam. 1. 6.

The best Interpretation of the Words, Jer. 23. 16. is,
He qui vocabit eam, that is, Christ. As for *Serius* his
 Cavils, they have been frequently and fully refuted.

in his Name, saith the Lord (Jehovah), where he which strengtheneth is One, and he by whom he strengtheneth is another, clearly distinguished from him, by the personal Pronoun, each of them is Jehovah, and yet Jehovah our God is one Jehovah.

Jehovah is the incommunicable Name of the One True God; a Name so peculiar to him, that he whose Name alone is Jehovah, is the most High over all the Earth; It is his Memorial to all Generations; A Name so incommunicably appropriate to himself, that He will not give it, nor the Glory and Perfection signified by it, to another. Being he the only I am, 'O ō, without Cause, without Time, without Beginning, without End; it must be owned, that the Name he assumed to himself distinguished him from every other Being, and particularly from the Idol Gods of

Psal. 83. 18.

Hos. 12. 5.

Isa. 42. 8.

Exod. 3. 15.

* See this proved in the 2. Let. to the Author of the Hist. of Mont. P. 5. vid. Mark in Hos. 12. 5. Calvin in Ps. 83. 18. & Lydek Exercit. Solus.

† Manasse Ben. Israel, Concil. ad Exod. 3. 15. Hæc habet verba; Perinde est ac si dixerit, Monstra illi, me esse, qui sum, i. e. Meam essentiam a seipso subsistere, nec ab alia dependere, ut ceteris omnibus que existunt, quia a me provenerunt, & ita sunt, ut potuerint, & adhuc possunt non esse: quod idem denotat Terragrammaticon. Bernard. L. 3. ad Eng. Deus est, quod est, i. e. summius, & omnium aliarum rerum esse, ipse sui, ipse omnibus est, ac per hoc quodammodo solus est. Videret Plaro Mose dicta suffragari; Deum saepius appellavit

To ō, i. e. autem ō, i. e. hanc ymnoponit auct avat vent, alia

the Nations. The Sun, one of their Gods * they worshipped, had no doubt a Being and existed; but *the One True God* is here characterized, that he is the 'O ω , i. e. Being it self *Independent and Self-existent*.

THE primary Signification of *Jehovah*, is, *Being*, as all know, and the most obvious Reason of the Name is, that God is Being itself, Independent †, necessarily existing, and Immutable; according to that of the Prophet, *I am* Mal. 3. 14: *Jehovah, I change not*, and that spoken by the Lord himself to Moses, *I am that* Exod. 3. 14: *I am*. In him is the whole Nature of Entity, and nothing hath any absolute perfect Being but God. And it is a Word of absolute Signification ‡ expressing the *Eternity and Independence* of the

E

the

* Est enim Sol, Aegyptiorum Osiris, &c. Vid. Vossian.

† Esse dicitur Deus, quia per se est, semper est, semper vivit, semper idem est. — Drusii Inaugram. C. 24.

Valer. Spicileg. Controversi. Nomen illud est nomen characteristicum, quo Deus se secerat voluit a reliquis Diis, Camero, Prælect. in Matth. 20. Aben. Exrs ad Psal. 101. ait, Jehovah notare Dei eternitatem atque immutabilitatem. Nomen hoc unum, ex omnibus Dei, maxime proprium habendum. Fuler. Miscel. L. 4. C. 13.

‡ Nomen יהוה ut derivatur ab יהי fuit, ita in sua significatione denotat aliquid quod est absolutissime cum se ipso. Vid. Leus. Philoz. Hab. Dissert. 27. The Word Jehovah is sometimes rendered by Θεός, so that the Word Θεός is not a relative Word. Some have made use of a Quibble, that Θεός is a relative Word, because we may say, my God, not my infinite Substance, besides other things, we say, Jehovah is attributed to Christ, a Word of absolute Signification, we cannot properly say, my

Jehovah

the *One True God* ; which might be proved at great length both from Scripture, and the Authorities of the best *Criticks* in this Case.

FROM all which our Lord Jesus Christ, may, by an easy and necessary Deduction, be clearly proved to be the independent Being and Substance ; as he is often in the Old Testament stiled Jehovah, the proper, peculiar, and incommunicable Name of the *One True God*, importing *necessary Existence* and absolute *independent Being*, the Fountain and Foundation of all that is or can be, he, I say, who has this Name and peculiar Character frequently and expressly ascribed to him, must have in himself the glorious Perfections signified by it ; that is, he must be owned to be *Eternal, necessarily Existent, and Independent* *. B. Pearson on the Creed 156, 158. expresseth himself thus, " I do assent unto this as a certain and infallible Truth, taught me by God himself, that Jesus Christ the only Son of God, is the True Jehovah who hath that Being, which is originally and eternally of itself, and on which all other Beings do essentially depend, that, by the Right of Emanation

Jehovah, the Jehovah of Israel. *Quoad textum C. 9. in nomine meo. Jehovah non sum in notus falsus. Animadvertit Gatakerus verum legendum esse interrogative, vid. Gatak. Miscell. P. 598.*

* Vid. Durham on Rev. C. 1, 4, 8.

tion of all Things from him, he hath
 " an absolute Supreme and universal
 " Dominion over all Things as God."
 * D. Owen affirms, that "Ο Ων, οντων,
 " are all the same Name of God, ex-
 " pressing his eternal and immutable
 " Self-existence, and in that Place ap-
 " plies these Names to the Son *."

CHAP. V.

*Our Lord JESUS CHRIST Ne-
 cessarily-Existent, or a Necessary-
 Being.*

THE *Independence* of our blessed
 Saviour has been proved and
 asserted; from whence it fol-
 lows, that he is a *Necessary Being*.
 The V. Assembly have found these
 propositions relevant and proven against
 Mr. Simson, viz. *That in teaching his*
students, he denied the Necessary-Exi-
stence of our Lord Jesus Christ; and
taught, That the Necessary-Existence of
our Lord Jesus Christ was a Thing we
know not: And that the Term Necessary-
Existence was Impertinent, and not to be
used in talking of the Trinity†.

E 2

IT

* D. Owen Expof. Heb. Vol. I. P. 124.

† Vid. Proceed. Aff. 1727, 1728. in the 8th.

It is not to my present Purpose to observe what Expressions under his own Hand occur in the Process, which corroborate what the Witnesses depone against him on this Article. Only it may be remarked, That he has not been able to advance one sound Author who takes Necessary-Existence to signify the *Father's* personal Property. This is one main Principle that D. Clarke endeavours to establish, and that D. Waterland sets himself to oppose, That *Necessary-Existence* is so peculiarly to be appropriated to the *Father*, as not to be applied to the *Son*. And the necessary *Generation* of the *Son* has been maintained by B. Bull * and others.

Our Confession Ch. 8. § 2. asserts That the *Son* is very and eternal God. And Ch. 2. § 1. The true God is infinite in Being and Perfection, Immutable ----- Infiniteness in Being and Perfection, and Immutability, infer Necessary Existence; and therefore, since Christ is very God, he must, according to the Confession be *Necessarily-Existent*. Which Doctrine is sufficiently confirmed from the Holy Scriptures.

John 16. 15. I. All Things whatsoever the Father hath are his †. And therefore all the

* Imp. Points of Prim. Christ. V. 2. P. 984. 923.

† Quod unus possidet singulorum est, Domino dicente, omnia quaecumque habet Pater, mea sunt. Z. Veron. cit. a Bull C. 7. P. 306.

Perfections that the *Father* hath, belong to him. And tho' some would willingly except *Independency* and *Necessary-Existence*; yet if they belong to the *Deity*, as such, as certainly they do, it follows by a necessary Consequence, that they also must belong to the *Son* as well as the *Father*, because he is truly God; and, in Reality, an inferior and dependent God is no God at all. A Contingent and precarious Being can not be the infinitely perfect *Being*; and can be no more than an excellent Creature. As to be and exist is a greater Perfection, than not to be, and not to exist; so to exist necessarily, is a greater Perfection * than to exist Contingently: Therefore the *Son*, to whom as the only true God, all possible Perfections are to be ascribed, *exists necessarily*. The *Son*, as we saw, is *Jehovah* as well as the *Father*, and must therefore exist *necessarily* and *independently* as well as the *Father*; since the Name *Jehovah*, intimates one that has *Independent* and *Necessary-Existence*. So that when D. Clark says, that all *divine Powers* are communicated to the *Son*; *except absolute Supremacy and Independency*; he makes an Exception in which he has neither Scripture nor Reason accompanying

E 3

nying

* The infinite Perfection of a Being or Nature consisteth in this, that it be absolutely and essentially necessary. *Psalm*. on the Cr. P. 18.

nying him. He has not the Scripture with him; because that tells us, that the *Son* hath whatsoever the *Father* hath. Nor has he Reason to support him, because whosoever is truly and properly God, must have every Thing that is essential to the *Deity* belonging to him. Now it appears from the whole Current of Scripture, That the *Son* of God has every Thing attributed to him, that can tend to raise our Ideas of his Dignity, and to denote a Person strictly and essentially Divine. He has all that the *Father* has, except his being a *Father*.

II. THE Creation of all Things is a distinguishing Character by which the True God was to be known; and, on the Account of which, he claims to himself all Homage, Worship and Adoration; and is the distinctive Character of the *Deity* from all false Gods.

Psal 96. 4.
5. Isa. 44.
24. Zech.
12. 1.

Now we are assured, as to the *Son*,
John 1. 3. *That all Things were made by him, and that without him was not any Thing made that was made* *. And elsewhere the Apostle Paul declares, *That the Son, by whom,*

Heb. 1. 2,
10, 11, 12.

* Dr. Water. says, " The Preposition *διὰ*, with a Genitive after it, is frequently used, as well in Scripture as Ecclesiastical Writers, to express the efficient Cause, as much as *ὅτι*, *ἐκ*, or *πρός*, or any other. (Vid. Rom. 11. 36.) And concludes, " That the Argument, drawn from the Proposition, is poor and trifling, as was long since observed by *Basil the Great*, who exposes its Author *Actius*. Vid. *Basil. de Spiri. Sancto*. P. 145. Cit. a Wat.

whom, in these last Days, God spake unto us, is he by whom also he made the Worlds. So that as through Faith we understand, That the Worlds were framed by the Word of God; so must we also believe, That they were made by the Son of God; which the Apostle doth not only, in the Entrance of his Epistle, deliver, but, in the Sequel, prove: For, shewing that greater Things have been spoken of him, than ever were attributed to any of the Angels, the most glorious of all the Creatures of God; amongst the rest he saith, The Scripture spake unto the Son, *Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever.* And not only so, but also, *Thou, Lord, in the Beginning, hast laid the Foundation of the Earth, and the Heavens are the Work of thine Hands,* &c. *. These Words were spoken to the Son of God, as the Apostle himself declares; and it appears, out of the Order and the Series of the Chapter; the Design of which is to declare the supereminent Excellency of our Saviour Christ; nay, the Conjunction *and* refers this Place of the *Psalmist* plainly to the former; of which he said expressly, *But unto the Son he saith.* As sure then as, *Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever,* was said unto the Son, so certain it is, *Thou, Lord,*

E 4

* See Dr. Water. Reasons for understanding this Text of Christ, *Def. Quær.* P. 95. And Mr. Johnson's Third Sermon on the Son's Dominion.

*Lord, hast laid the Foundation of the Earth, was said unto the same **. Nor is it possible to avoid the Apostle's Connection, by attributing the Destruction of the Heavens, out of the last Words, to the Son, (*As a Vesture thou shalt fold them up, and they shall be changed*) and denying the Creation of them, out of the first, to the same. For it is most evident, That there is but one † Person spoken to; and that the Destruction, and Creation of the Heavens, are both attributed to the same; It is therefore an undeniable Truth, grounded upon the Profession of the Psalmist, and the Interpretation of the Apostle, That the Son of God created the World.

Col. 1. 16,
17.

FARTHER, the same Apostle saith elsewhere of the Son, *By him were all Things created that are in Heaven, and that are in Earth, visible and invisible; whether they be Thrones, or Dominions, or Principalities, or Powers; all Things were created by him and for him: And he is before all Things, and by him all Things consist.* Here the Apostle asserteth, in the

* *Πρὸς αὐτοῦ γὰρ καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ πάντα ἐγένετο, ὡς ὅτι τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ.* Athenag. P. 38.

† The Exception of *Scipius*, That there is a *Comma* wanting after *καὶ* in the Greek, is of no Weight. It is evident there are Distinctions in the Greek Copies after that Conjunction. No Argument can be drawn from a few ancient Copies, which all know were abundantly careless of Distinctions. In the Syriack Transl, *and* is added, Vid. *Owen in locum.*

the vulgar Phrase of *Moses*, *By him were all Things created that are in Heaven, and that are in Earth*; signifying thereby, That he speaketh of the same Creation. Farther, by a Division which *Moses* never used, as describing the Production only of corporeal Substances; lest therefore those immaterial Beings might seem exempted from the Son's Creation, he addeth, *visible and invisible*; and lest, in that invisible World, among the many Degrees that possibly may be in the Celestial Hierarchy, any Order might seem exempted from an Essential Dependence upon him, he nameth those which are of greatest Eminence, *whether they be Thrones, or Dominions, &c.* Nor doth it yet suffice thus to extend the Object of his Power, by asserting all Things to be made by him, except it be so understood, as to acknowledge the Sovereignty of his Person, and the Authority of his Action: For, lest we should conceive the Son of God framing the World as an Instrumental Cause*, which worketh by and for another, he sheweth him as well the Final as the Efficient Cause; for *all Things were created by him, and for him*. And whereas all Things first received their

* *De Vries*, in his *Exercit. De Deo Creatore*, shews the Folly and Absurdity of making a Creature, how excellent soever, so much as an Instrumental Cause in Creation.

their Being by Creation, and when they have received it, continue in the same by virtue of God's Conservation, *In whom we live, and move, and have our Being.* Left, in any Thing, we should be thought not to depend immediately upon the Son of God, he is described as the *Conserver*, as well as the *Creator*; for *he is before all Things, and by him all Things consist.* Here we have so complete a Description of the Creator of the World applied to the Son, that the Father is no where more plainly or fully set forth unto us as the Maker of the same. This Text cannot possibly be understood of a new Creation; seeing not only wicked Men, but the Angels, whether good or bad, that are said to have been created by the *Son*, are no constituent Parts of the new Creation.

THESE who deny our Lord Jesus Christ to be a necessary Being, do consequentially assert, That the Creator of the World, who gave a Being to all Things, is himself no more than a contingent Being; That he, upon whom all Things do therefore depend, is himself Dependent; That he, who gave every Being *Existence*, has himself a precarious Existence, Finite and Limited Powers. All which, is to assert the most absurd Contradictions.

CREATION is appropriated in Scripture to the *One Self-Existent God.* *I am*
Jehovah

Jehovah that maketh all Things, That
 stretcheth forth the Heavens alone, That
 spreadeth abroad the Earth by my self.

Isa. 44. 24.

Neh. 9. 6.

It is a Work peculiar to God; and by
 this the God of *Israel* is distinguished
 from all false Gods. The Apostle *Paul*
 represents the Order and Frame of the
 visible World, as an evident Demon-
 stration of the Power and Godhead of
 him that created it; so is it, by Con-
 sequence, as evident a Demonstration;
 That none could create it but the Eter-
 nal God. To talk of a Creature endued
 with the Power of Creating, is a direct
 confounding the Creature and the Cre-
 ator. It has long ago been demonstra-
 ted, by such as have treated this Argu-
 ment, That this Work can be effected
 by no Power less than Infinite. And,
 to suppose a Finite Being endued with
 Infinite Powers, is to imagine the most
 absurd Contradiction. In Scripture it is
 every where spoken of as a Divine Act.
 Not so much as a Grain of Sand said to
 be created by an Angel * or Archangel.
 And reasonable it is to suppose, That
 nothing can come into Being by any
 Power less than his who is the *Fountain*
 of all *Being*. Yea, it is impossible, in
 the

* Nihil in totum Diabolus invenitur fecisse, videlicet
 cum ipse creatura sit Dei, quemadmodum & reliqui An-
 geli, *Iren.* P. 228. Vid. *Bull. D. F.* P. 291. Οὐδὲ γὰρ
 οὐδὲ ἄγγελοι δημιουργοὶ δύνασθαι, κτισμάτα ὄντες καὶ
 αὐτοί. *Athen. Orat.* 2. P. 482.

the Nature of the Thing, That a Derived Dependent Being should create and give Being to any Thing, far less to all Things.

FROM what has been advanced, it is very manifest, That, to give Being to all Things, is the peculiar and distinguishing Character of the *One True God*, who is himself a *Necessary Being*; and that our Lord Jesus Christ is the Creator of the Universe, of Men, of Angels, and of all Things *: He is therefore the *Fountain* of all *Being*, the first Cause and Origin of all Things: He is therefore *Self-Existent*; and if *Self-Existent*, then *Necessarily Existent*; since contingent Beings do depend upon the Power and Will of the *First Cause* for their Being, the *First Cause*, being *Independent*, is therefore a *Necessary Being*. It is impossible, That he that is the *First Cause* should not have been; or else it is impossible he should ever have been; and impossible that any Thing should have ever existed. Nothing more plain, than that our Lord Jesus is the *Fountain* of all *Being*, and therefore a *Necessary Being*.

III. OUR

* Αγγελων δημιουργος, Tatian. P. 21, 26. Παντα ε λεγος ποιει, τα ολα δημιουργει---Clem. Alex. P. 310. Δημιουργον πων παν ων---Origen apud Huet. P. 38. Ο δημιουργος λεγος, Ο ποιητης ων όλων, Euseb. in Psalm. P. 125. The Ancients understanding Gen. 1. 26. of a Trinity of Persons, maketh it evident, they thought the Son, as well as the Father, the Creator of the World.

III. OUR Lord Jesus Christ is *simply* and *absolutely* Eternal; and therefore a *Necessary Being*. It must be owned there is no Occasion for putting the Epithets of *Simple*, or *Absolute*, to the Word *Eternal*, which every one understands better without; it being absurd to suppose an Unlimited and a Limited Eternity; which is, in Reality, an Eternity, and no Eternity, were it not that some have invented, and made Use of these imaginary Distinctions, which therefore must be obviated.

The absolute Eternity of our Lord Jesus Christ is inculcated with that Frequency and Solemnity throughout the Holy Scriptures, that he who runs may read it. This Truth is revealed and confirmed *Prov. 8. 22. The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his Way*, before his Works of old; I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the Earth was †. When he prepared the Heavens I was there. --- When he appointed the Foundation of the Earth, then was I by him as one brought up with him, and I was daily his Delight, rejoicing always before him, rejoicing in the* *babi-*

* Vulg. Latin read, *Possedit me*. So do *Aquila* and *Theodoti-n*. The *Arians* perverted this Text, taking Advantage of the corrupt Translation of the *LXX* but the Corruption hath long since been confessed, the Word signifies to possess by Generation, *Gen 3. 15*.

† Vid. *Owen*, & *Savile* in loc.

habitable Parts of the Earth, and my Delights were with the Sons of Men. It is *Wisdom* that here speaks, and is spoken of. This we believe to be he who is the *Wisdom of God*, even his *Eternal Son*. The *Arians* themselves granted, that it is the Son of God, which is here spoken of, and that it is so, is most evident from comparing this Chapter with the first and ninth Chapters of this Sacred Book. In the whole Discourse *Wisdom* speaks as a Divine Person; assumes Personal Authority and Power; maketh Personal Promises upon Performance of Duties due only to God himself. Divine Actions, and Personal Properties, such as Eternity, are ascribed to *Wisdom*. That our Lord Jesus is the Divine Person spoken of appears from this, that the Things here spoken of, are elsewhere attributed to him, particularly in these Scriptures marked in the Margin. And which is to the present Purpose, his absolute Eternity is here asserted, and that in as strong Terms, as the Eternity of the Father is elsewhere expressed by. Not only is the Son said to be before the World and all the Works of Creation, that is, from Eternity; but also the original Word which we translate, *from everlasting*, is the very same which we meet with in *Psalms* 90. 2. where a parallel Description of Eternity

Phil. 2. 8,
25. Rev. 19.
16, 22. Joh.
1. 1, 2, 3,
23, 24. Col.
2. 15. Rev.
22. 1, 14.

applied to the One God. In Answer to the Proclamation made of the Name of God, (*Exod. 34. 6.*) The Prophet makes a Declaration of the Name of the *Messiah* the Child promised, his Name shall be called *Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the everlasting Father*; a Name of the same import with that of the *Ancient of Days*. Isa. 9. 6.

To the same Purpose it is said, *His goings forth have been of Old, from Everlasting* *. These Words are an express Description of the Person of the *Messiah*, who, tho' he was to be Born in the fulness of Time at *Bethlehem*; yet the Existence of his Divine Nature was from of Old, from Everlasting. The ancient *Jews* † harmoniously agree, and the Modern generally acknowledge, that it is the *Messiah* who is intended; and the signal Accomplishment of this Prediction is recorded by the Evangelists.

AGAIN the Eternity of the One True God is thus described, *I am the First*, Isa. 44. 6.
and *I am the Last*. — In like Manner, the Son saith of himself, *I am the First and I am the last, I am Alpha and Omega, the Beginning and the End*. And Rev. 1. 17.
Rev. 22. 13.
before Abraham was *I am*, not *I was*:
Even

* Ο εν αρχη προς τον Θεον, Θεος Λογος, και τας αιωνας εκουσας απ' αρχης εχων. Theodor. (hoc verbum) in principio apud Deum; & idcirco egressus ejus a diebus aternitatis. Hieron.

† Targum.

Even as it is not said of the Eternity of the One God, (*Psal.* 90. 2.) From everlasting *Thou was*, but *Thou art God*.

Psal. 102.
26, 27.

A Description of absolute Eternity is given by the Psalmist, *They shall perish, but thou shalt endure*: (or stand, as the Word signifies) *but thou art the same, and thy Years shall have no End.* Which is applied to our Lord Jesus by the Apostle Paul, *Heb.* 1. Where he attributes two Things to our Blessed Saviour; the Creation of Heaven and Earth, and the Abolition or Change of them: And then proceeds to illustrate the *Eternity* and Immutability of their Creator. It is here said of Christ, That he *remaineth* or *abideth*, that he is the same, and his Years fail not. One and the same Thing is intended in all these Expressions; even his *Eternal* and absolutely immutable Existence. *Eternity* is not amiss called a *nunc stans**; a present Existence, wherein, or whereunto, nothing is past or future; it being always wholly present in and to it self. This is express in that (*διὰ μένεις*) *Thou standest, endurest, changeest not.* The same is also express in the next Words (*ὁ αὐτός εἶ*) *Thou art he*, or art the same.

* Ad alteram nostræ descriptionis partem progredior, qua simultaneam esse æternitatis durationem diximus. Eam impugnare laborant Socini & Vossii sectatores, quod nimis sibi plaudunt in quibusdam quas hic arguunt argutiis, seipsa parum se subtiles probant. Vid. hæc &c. de *Uris* exercit. de Dei æter,

ame, or as the *Syriack* hath it, *The*
ame that thou art. There is an Allusi-
 on in these Words unto, if not an Ex-
 pression of, that Name of God, *I am*,
 that is, *Who is of himself, and in himself*,
 always absolutely and unchangeably the
 same. The last Expression, tho' Meta-
 phorical, is of the same Importance,
My Years fail not. That is, the Crea-
 tures, whose Duration is reckoned by
 Years, they do fail and come to an
 end; but of his Being and Existence
 who is Creator, there is neither Begin-
 ning nor End; because he is absolutely
 Eternal.

As we find the *Father* described from
 his Eternal Being, without all Begin-
 ning or Ending, *Rev. 1. 4.* so our Lord
 Jesus Christ asserteth his own absolute
 eternity, *Ver. 8.* of the same Chapter,
 in the very same Terms. That the De-
 scription there given is to be under-
 stood of Christ, is evident from the
 precedent and following Words to the
 text. And Dr. *Waterland* has obser-
 ved, That *nothing is more certain, than*
that that very Text, (Rev. 1. 8.) was un-
derstood by the Ante-Nicene Writers, in
*general, of God the Son**. In like Man-
 ner it is said to him, by the whole hea-
 venly Host, *We give thee Thanks, O* *Rev. 11. 17*
and, which art, and wast, and art to
come.

F

UPON

UPON the Whole, it is very manifest, That the Son is absolutely *Eternal* *, and because so, he cannot possibly be a Contingent Being; which is as evident, as that if he had been a Contingent Being, he could not have been absolutely Eternal. An Eternal Being has no Beginning of Existence, nor change in Duration; and is Independent and Self-Existent. All which fully evince, That our Lord Jesus Christ, who is absolutely Eternal, is therefore a *necessary Being* †.

CHAP.

* See in the following Words of *Austin*, the Answer made by the *Catholics* to one principal Argument of the *Arians*, Interrogant *Arian*, *utrum Pater Filium volens an nolens genuerit*; ut si responsum fuerit, quod volens genuerit, dicant, pater ergo est voluntas patris; quod autem nolens genuerit quis potest dicere? vicissim quaeritur ab eo, utrum Deus Pater, volens an nolens sit Deus? ut si responderet, *nolens*, sequeretur illa miseria, quam de Deo credere, magna insania est; si autem diceret, *volens* responderetur ei, ergo & ipse Deus est sua voluntate non natura; quid ergo restabit, nisi ut obmutesceret. *August. Con. Arian. Lib. 1. Pag. 826. Cit. a Wat.* Quod ante tempus natum est, semper est natum. Quia id quod est ante æternum tempus, hoc semper est; quod autem semper est natum; non admittit ne aliquando non fuerit; quia aliquando non fuisse, jam non est semper esse. *Harlar de Trinit. Pag. 1127. Sissinius* long ago observed, That the Ancients never would attribute any beginning to the Son of God, believing him to have been co-eternal with the Father. *Socrat. 1. E. H. L. 5. Chap. 10. Cit. a Wat.*

† *Christ's necessary Existence* is maintained by Dr. *Waterland*, *Bp. Bull*, *Bp. Pearson*, and all Orthodox Divines.

C H A P. VI.

*Our Lord JESUS CHRIST the
same in Substance with the Father.*

THERE is a *true and peculiar* *
Unity in the Godhead; tho' that
is of such a Nature as to be
consistent with a *Trinity*. There is but
one *Godhead*; and therefore there nei-
ther is nor can be more than *One* God.
God would not have been an infinitely
perfect Being, if he were not necessa-
rily, or were not necessarily what he
is. Now let us but offer to suppose
there are *more Gods* than *One*, and
there will be no Possibility of giving
any Evidence, as to each of them that
they are *Necessarily*. And also, Two in-
finite Beings or Substances there can-
not be; because either the one of them
would include the other, and so the in-
cluded must needs be finite; or it
would not extend to the other, and so
it self would not be infinite. If we look
into the Holy Scripture, we shall find
F 2 the

* Hic Deus unus est, --- nec unus est specie, comple-
tate plura individua: --- sed ira unus est, ut nulla uni-
tas similis isti in mundo reperitur. *Moyses Maimonides*, de
Funda. Leg.

the *Unity* of God loudly proclaimed from one End to the other. *Ye are my Witnesses, saith the Lord, before me there was no God formed, neither shall there be after me. I am the First, and I am Last, and besides me there is no God. Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord* (Jehovah). The *Jews* were straitly charged to hear this, and let it be deeply impressed upon them. Our Blessed Lord himself represents that *Unity* of God, that is so strongly asserted in the Book of *Deuteronomy*, to be the capital Article of Faith, and the Worship that is thereupon due to God alone, to be the *first* and *great Commandment*. And when the Apostle *Paul* would represent the Conversion of the *Thessalonians*, he says, *They turned to God from Idols, to serve the living and true God.*

Isa. 43. 10.
& 44. 6, 8.

Deut. 4. 6.

Mark 12.
29, 30.

1 Thes. 1. 9.

The Body of the *Jews*, however once prone to *Idolatry*, have been immovably fix'd in the Belief of *God's Unity*, as is evident from their *Thirteen Articles of Faith* composed by *Maimonides*, the second whereof is the *Unity of the Blessed God*. And the wiser *Pagans*, tho' they knew not how to get clear of *Polytheism*, were yet very far from supposing several *Supreme, Independent Deities*. They commonly reckon'd there was but *One Supreme God*, and that the rest were but *Subordinate*. But tho' this was the common Sense of the *Pagan World*,

W
ra
S
fu
th
is,
Op
Tr
ca
bo
son
"
"
"
"
"
"
"
Sim
Scr
finc
tur
Subj
in l
ber
liev
Subj
* A
Mrom
ceate
† F
‡ S

World, yet there is not the least warrant from Scripture to bring this *Pagan Scheme* into Christianity, that in effect subverts the whole of *revealed Religion**.

THE venerable Assembly have found the Fourth Article of the *Libel*, which is, *The Professor's teaching, as his own Opinion, That the Three Persons of the Trinity are not to be said to be numerically One in Substance or Essence*†; both relevant and sufficiently proven.

To which I may add, what Mr. *Simson* himself saith elsewhere. "Perhaps some may think it a Discovery deserving much Applause, if the Presbytery will shew in what Place of Scripture it is plainly revealed, That the *Substance*, in the Three Divine *Persons*, is *One in Number*, and not *Three in Number*." No doubt Mr. *Simson* gives most Credit to what the Scriptures most plainly reveal; and since he seems to think, That the Scripture more plainly reveals, That the *Substance*, in the Three Persons, is *Three in Number*, than that it is *One in Number*‡; we must conclude, That he believes, that the *Three Persons* are *Three Substances*. He says likewise, "I care-fully

F 3

* Ausi sunt Ariani & Macedoniani, Deum magnum & parvum inducere, Hellenismam in Ecclesiam introducentes. *Chris. de Trin. Cap. 6.*

† Proceed. Ass. 1728. Pag. 29, 30.

‡ *State, P. 173.*

“ fully avoid confounding *One Undi-*
 “ *vided Essence* with one *Substance* in
 “ Number *. And he pretends to the
 Authority of *Zanchius*, to countenance
 this his Distinction betwixt *Essence* and
Substance: But it is very plain, That
Zanchius (*Lib. 1. Cap. 2.* cited by Mr.
Simson) says no more than what Dr.
Owen has done, † “ That every *Person*
 “ hath distinctly its own *Substance*; for
 “ the one Substance of the *Deity* is the
 “ *Substance* of each *Person*; so it is still
 “ but One: But each *Person* hath not
 “ its own *Distinct Substance*, because
 “ the Substance of them all is the same,
 “ as hath been proved.” And else-
 where, ‖ “ A Divine Person is nothing
 “ but the Divine Essence, upon the
 “ Account of an especial Property sub-
 “ sisting in an especial Manner, as, in
 “ the Person of the Father, there is the
 “ Divine Essence or Being, with its
 “ Property of Begetting the Son.” For
Zanchy, in the foresaid Place, gives an
 Hint at the Dispute that happened be-
 twixt the *Greek* and *Latin* Churches a-
 bout the Word *Hypostasis*. The latter
 was not satisfied with that Term, to de-
 note the Distinction there is between
 the sacred Three, which, in their Opi-
 nion,

* Ibid. P. 91.

† *Dof. Trin. Vind.* P. 86.

‖ Ibid. P. 83.

nion, signified * *Substance* or *Being*. It is known, That, to prevent further Differences, it was declared, That this Term was intended to intimate a *Subsistence*. And that learned Author, both there and elsewhere, contends strenuously for the *Numerical Substance* or *Essence*; both against these who said, He was not of the same *Essence* with the Father, but ἐξ ἄκων; and those who said, That he was of the same *Substance*, but *per traducem*, and of an alike *Essence*, but not of the same in Number. He likewise asserts, That the Generation of the *Son* is absolutely Eternal; That he is begotten not by *Will*, but by Nature, and that he is *Deus natura*; and, by Consequence, that he is a Necessary Being; and proves, That the Name *Jehovah*, importing *Necessary Existence* and Independent Being, is ascribed to him in innumerable Places of Scripture; and maintains it, That he, together with the *Father* and *Holy Spirit*, is the *One True Eternal God*. He guards, with some Caution, against *Sabellianism*, which is likewise a pernicious Extreme; and shews, That a Trinity is not *One God* with Three Qualities, or *Nominal Differences*, but that, in the *One Godhead*, there are Three Persons,

F 4

Persons,

* Miramur illos Catholicos probari posse, qui Patris, & Filii, & Spiritus Sancti, tres Substantias constituentur. *Fulgent.*

Persons, tho' the same in Substance or Essence, yet truly distinguished from one another, by their Personal Properties; so that the *Father* cannot be the *Begotten Son*, nor the *Son* the *Unbegotten Father*. Tho' he doth not pretend to define the Nature of these Personal Characters, which is not revealed; *Persona*, saith he, (in the Place referred to) *est ipsa Essentia Divina, proprio subsistendi modo distincta*. And below, — *Possumus vere dicere, Ipsum Patrem esse ipsam Divinam Essentiam, non simpliciter, sed quatenus cum hac Proprietate consideratur, quæ est, esse Ingenitum, & Generare; & ita Filium esse eandem Essentiam Divinam, non simpliciter, sed quatenus cum hac Proprietate huic peculiari consideratur, quæ est, esse a Patre genitum*— *Quid enim est Pater? est Deus Ingenitus, & Generans. Quid Filius? Deus non Generans, sed Genitus*— From all which it is evident, That *Owen* and *Zanchy*, these two great Men speak the same Thing on this important Point. And that if they seem at any Time to drop any Expressions that *Mr. Simson* would construct as favouring some Part of his Hypothesis, their Agreement with him is in Sound, and in Words, and not in Sense or Meaning. But since it has not only been found proven against him, that he denied that the Persons of the Trinity are numerically one

in *Substance* or *Essence*. But he defends this *Proposition*, by inculcating a Distinction betwixt the *Essence*, it seems, common to all the Persons, and the *Substance* which is not *One* in *Number*, and therefore certainly *Two* or more in *Number*. It appears he hath receded from the Doctrine received in this, and in all the Christian Churches. *Substantia* according to the common Meaning of the Word among the *Latins*, and as used in Philosophy, is *ens per se existens*. Now since, according to him, (as the Assembly have found.) The Father is one *Substance* in *Number*, The Son another *Substance* in *Number*. Then, according to the other Propositions found proven against him, the Father is a *necessary Substance*, and the Son a distinct and a *contingent Substance*; in so far so, that *Necessary-Existence*, the Term *Supremus Deus*, and the Title of the *Only True God*, may be taken in a Sense that includes the personal Property of the Father, and so not belonging to the Son, which appears so Gross at first View, that I need not further lay it open.

THIS gross Opinion is contrary to our Confession and Catechisms * where it is asserted, That *there is but one only living and True God*. That in the *Unity of the Godhead*, there are *Three Persons of one Sub-*

* Confess. C. 2. Sect. 1. 3. Larg. Cat. Anl. to Q. 9.

Substance. — And that there be Three Persons in the Godhead, the Father, the Son, and Holy Ghost, and these Three are One True Eternal God, the same in Substance, equal in Power and Glory, although distinguished by their personal Properties. All which laid together, imports such a strict Unity in the Godhead, as there can be but one Substance, One in Number, or Numerically, and can never be reconciled to the Notion of Three distinct Substances or Beings in the Godhead.

BEFORE I proceed to confirm the Doctrine of the numerical Oneness laid down in our Confession, I may add, what the Learned D. Waterland, (whom I suppose, no Man of common Understanding will charge with Sabellian Principles) has said excellently to this Purpose, viz. “ If therefore the Son, according to the *Nicene Fathers*, was not from any other Substance besides the Father’s, nor from Nothing; it is very plain, that unless they supposed a Division of Substance, which they absolutely reject, they supposed the Son to be of the same *undivided* or *individual Substance* with the Father *.” And he says to his Opponent, “ It lyes upon you in this Case, to prove the *Negative*, viz. That no Union whatever, can make two Per-

sons

* D. Waterland Def. 463.

sons one Being, One to ~~God~~, One God. You are to shew the Supposition impossible, in the Nature of the Thing, that is, I humbly conceive, you are to prove, what you can know nothing of, and are to work up a Demonstration without *Ideas*, and adds elsewhere, † "Nor would Sabellius have been censured for holding one *Hypostasis* only, had he meant One Substance. — The Truth is, the Church also professed One Substance; One Eternal, Immutable, uncreated Substance, and this they understood by God, notwithstanding they believed the Son, and Holy Spirit to be Substantially God. Praxeas, Noetus, Sabellius, &c. not conceiving how one Substance could be more than one Person innovated upon the Faith of the Church." And gives it as his Opinion, "That from his (D. Clark) declaring expressly against the Consubstantiality of the Son, whether Specifick or Individual, — as also from his excluding the Son out of the One Godhead. — It is exceeding clear, that he has determined against the Church, and declared for *Arianism*." Dr. Clark owns, That *Infinite Substance* is a Definition of the Supreme God, in the metaphysical Sense. We know

† D. Waterland P. 464. 329. 351, 212.

know nothing of two infinite Substances or Beings, which would imply a gross Contradiction. To deny the Son to be the One infinite Substance or Being would be impious Blasphemy against the whole of Divine Revelation contained in the Holy Scriptures, which with the greatest Harmony and most convincing Evidence assert his *proper Deity*. And we know nothing of one Supreme and another inferior God : Nor of three Substances in One undivided *Essence*, or of a Distinction betwixt *Essence* and *Substance*. These have been looked upon as Synonymous Terms both by the Ancients, and by the Moderns, such as Dr. *Owen*, Dr. *Waterland*, and others. But we maintain the Catholick Doctrine, that the Three Persons of the ever blessed Trinity are of one Substance or *Essence*.

I. THIS Unity of Substance or Essence is plainly and fully asserted in Scripture. *Moses* instructs *Israel* in the Faith of this Article, *Hear, O Israel, Jehovah our God is one Jehovah*. We have seen above, that our Lord Jesus Christ is the God of *Israel*, and the *Jehovah*. Wherefore, in this Place, together with the Father, and the Holy Spirit, he is said to be the One Jehovah * ;

* Cum filium & Patrem nominamus duos Deos, non dicimus; siquidem nobis est unus Deus, uti *Moses* asserit, *Deut. 6. 4. Epiphani. in Anagor.*

that is, the One Infinite, Eternal, and Independent *Being* or *Substance*.

AND as this Doctrine hath been taught by * *Moses*, so a *Greater* than *Moses*, our Lord *Jesus Christ* himself, asserts the Unity of *Substance* or *Essence*, when he says, *I and my Father are One*; John 10. 30
not *one Person*; but *One, only, living and true God*, of the same *Substance* or *Essence*: Which is the plain Meaning of the Text, as appears, if we consider, that because *Christ* in the Text called God his *Father*, the *Jews* by a just Consequence presently inferr'd, *That he made himself God, and equal to God*. And yet *Christ* was so far from denying the Inference, (as most certainly he would and ought to have done, if it had not been true) that he confirms it in such a Manner, as neither to provoke their farther Malice, nor yet to stifle the Truth. Their Charge of Blasphemy against him was; *Thou being a Man, makest thy self God*. In answer to which, he tells them, in Effect, that he could not blaspheme by calling himself the *Son of God*, thereby denying the Charge of Blasphemy; but allowing at the same

* Non ignoravit *Moses*, unum Deum, hoc est, unam Divinitatis naturam, in *dyavolici* Triadi adorari, nimirum in Patre, Filio, & Spiritu Sancto; quamvis enim substantiis propriis subsistere credantur; --- Pater enim est Pater, Filius Filius, Spiritus Spiritus. Identitas tamen essentiarum eos ad unitatem colligit. *Cyrl. L. 4. contra Julian.*

same Time, that the *Terms God, and Son of God*, signify one and the same Thing. Which he more expressly declares in the beginning of the next Chapter, where he saith to the Disciples, *This Sickness (of Lazarus) is not unto Death, but for the Glory of God, that the Son of God may be glorified thereby.* Here the Words *God and Son of God*, are used as Terms of the same Import and Significancy. It is obvious likewise, That our Saviour here ascribeth the Preservation of his Sheep, not to the *Will*, but to the *Power*, of his Father; and to his own *Power*, which he proveth to be the same with the Power of his Father, *i. e. Omnipotence*; because, saith our Lord, *I and the Father are One, One God, One in Power*, because *One in Substance or Essence*. This is the obvious Meaning of the Text, which is farther illustrated, from what he says in the Context. *As the Father knoweth me, even so I know the Father*; with the same *comprehensive Knowledge*, which were Blasphemy for any Being * but the *One God* to pretend to. For, *Who by searching can find out God, even the Almighty to Perfection?* He says farther, *I have Power to lay it (my Life)*
down

John 10. 15.

Ver. 18.

* Καὶ οὕτως ὡς καὶ ὅταν ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ λέγεται, ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ὁμοιωσιμότης, ἀλλὰ ἀξιοῦς ὁμοιωσιμότης, ὡς καὶ ἐν τῇ ἑκκλῆσιᾳ. Non solus sed cum veteri Ecclesia sic Interpretor. Zanch. in Loc.

down, and I have Power to take it again. What more convincing Arguments of Omnipotence can be adduc'd, than that our Lord is Creator of the Universe, (which is proved in thir Sheets), and that he not only has Power to quicken dead Souls, and raise dead Bodies, but to raise himself from the Dead? Again, he is so *One* in Substance or *Essence* with the Father, that *He giveth to his Disciples eternal Life, and they shall never perish.* Now eternal Life is expressly affirmed to be the *Gift of God.* And it is a convincing Evidence, that *Our Jesus* is the *One God*; because, he hath purchased by his own Merits, promisseth in his own Name, and bestoweth by his own Power, *eternal Life* upon all that believe in his Name; yea, and he is that *eternal Life* himself, *for this Life is in the Son, and he that hath the Son, hath Life.* It is Life, it is Heaven, to know him, to enjoy him, who is the *True God, and eternal Life.* And towards the Close of this Chapter, our Lord declares, That there is a glorious, Mysterious, Mutual, essential *In-being* of the Persons of the Godhead. *That ye may know and believe, that the Father is in me, and I in the Father* *, which undeniably

Context,
Ver. 26:

Rom. 6. 23:

John 11, 12.

John 17. 3.
John 5.
20.

Ver. 38.

* Sunt enim in se invicem Personæ Trinitatis & se mutuo permeant, immanentque, Nam quælibet eorum habet Essentiam, --- ut hinc in Filio vera sit Divinitas eadem, quæ in Patre est, & una persona nominata.

deniably proves the numerical *Oneness* of *Substance* or *Essence* : It is therefore very manifest from Text and Context, that our Lord asserts himself to be one God with the *Father* ; and that since Magistrates, because of some Resemblance to God in their Office, are called Gods figuratively, how much more might he, being *one God* with the *Father*, be called God in the most proper Sense of the Word.

AND the Apostle *John* saith to the same Purpose, *There are Three that bear Record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one.* " The three heavenly Witnesses " (saith that excellent Author, the " Learned Dr. Calamy) are *One Thing*, " which cannot be said of the Three " Witnesses on Earth ; for they are different Things. These are *so One*, that " all the Three have but *One* and the " same *Substance*. Tho' they testify " distinctly, yet they are One, not only in *Consent* and *Will*, but in *Essence* " too, in the very same Sense as our " Lord said, *I and my Father are One.* " And this *Oneness* can respect nothing but the Nature, Being, Substance or Essence of God. God is one in this Respect. And the whole *Divine Nature*

alteras includat per istam Εὐσεβίου, sic iterum, Athanasius, Hilarius, Cyrillus, Layde Exercit. de Symbolo Moysi, Pag. 50. * See Dr. Calamy on the Text.

is in Father, Son and Holy Ghost, and in each of them consider'd distinctly, as one of the Ancients says, "Tho' there are Three, in whom the Godhead is, yet there is in them Three but one Godhead. †" And whereas it is questioned, If these Three are not distinguished by some Perfections, how are they at all distinguished? It is answered, Tho' the Scriptures represent them as having all Divine Perfections in common, they yet distinguish them by their Relation to each other, and by their different Concern and OEconomy in the Salvation of Fallen Man. We do not assert a *Trinity of Gods*, which would be a Contradiction, but a *Trinity in the Godhead*. And we have no Reason to be ashamed, frankly to own our selves ignorant, how the *Father, Son and Holy Ghost*, subsist in the *One Divine Nature*; since the Scriptures no where tell us, either in what Manner, the *Son* is begotten of the *Father*, or in what Manner the *Holy Ghost* proceeds from *Father and Son*. It is enough for us to believe a *Trinity in the Deity*, because we have it revealed to us in our Sacred Records. 'Tis no new Thing for the *Christian Scheme* to be ridicul'd about its *Trinity in Unity*. For that profane Wretch *Luther*, who lived as long ago as in the

G Year

† Gregor. Naz. 37 de. Sp. Sancto.

Year of our Lord 176. speaks of a God that was *One of Three*, and *Three of One*, which he represents as most absurd.* 'Tis most certainly the *God* of Christians that is there referred to, and blasphemously insulted! And the Passage shews, that it was at that Time the current Apprehension of the *Pagans*, That the *Christians* believed a *God* that was *One* and yet *Three*, or *Three* in one Deity. *Socinus* took Notice of this Passage with Surprise, and did not stick to declare, That he knew nothing in all Antiquity more clear for the Mystery of the Trinity, according to the modern Notion of it. But those People justly deserve to fall under a general Contempt, that will be banter'd out of their Religion by a profane Jest. The great Mysteries of the Christian Religion such as the *Incarnation* of the *Son of God*, a *Trinity* in *Unity*, and *Unity* in *Trinity*, were what such Wretches as *Celsus*, and *Porphyry*, *Julian*, and *Lucian* ridicul'd. But, both in ancient and modern Times *Wisdom is justified of her Children*. If we may represent every Thing of that Nature as absurd in itself, because we cannot conceive how it can be, we may lay the Scriptures aside, and follow our own Fancies. For what can a Divine Revelation signifie, that must be under-

* See *Le Moyn Varia Sacra*, Vol. 2. Page 186.

our Correction! Several of the Divine Perfections, demonstrable from the Principles of Natural Religion, such as *Omnipresence* and *Eternity*, can no more be accounted for by us, than a *Trinity* in *Unity*.

II. *Father* and *Son* are one Object of Religious Worship and Adoration. We are baptised in the Name of *Father*, *Son* and *Holy Spirit*: And if these into whose Name we are baptised, be not *One* in *Nature*, we are, by our Baptism, engaged into the Worship of more Gods than *One*. If Christ is not God by *Nature*, he is excluded from being the Object of our Worship; but it is plain from our Gal. 4. 8, being baptised in his Name, and from other Arguments that shall be adduced, that he is the proper Object of Religious Worship. He is therefore *God* by *Nature*; and if by *Nature* so, he has the same *Nature* with the *One God*. And (as Dr. Owen expresseth himself) "This natural *Godhead* of God is, * the *Substance* or *Essence* with all the Holy Divine Excellencies, which naturally and necessarily appertain thereunto. This *One Nature* or *Essence* being the *Nature* or *Essence* of God as God, is the *Nature* or *Essence* of the *Father*, *Son*, and *Spirit*: *One* and the same absolutely in and unto each of " them.

G 2

* Dr. Owen's Doct. Trin. Vind.

“ them. For none can be God as they
“ are revealed to be, but by Virtue of
“ this Divine *Nature* or *Being*. Herein
“ consists the *Unity* of the *Godhead*.”

OUR Lord Jesus representeth him-
self with the Father, as one proper Ob-
ject of Faith. *Ye believe in God, believe*
also in me. Now Scripture and Reason
plainly teach us, That God alone is the
proper Object of Faith. And yet here
our Saviour makes the Act of Believing
to be the same, whether fixt upon God,
or upon himself: And certainly the I-
dentity of the Act strongly implies an
Equality in the Object: In whom can
we believe, as both able and willing to
help us in every Thing that our indi-
gent Nature stands in Need of, but an
Almighty and All-sufficient Being, the
Infinite and Eternal God?

III. 'Tis plain, That God being the
Father, and Christ being the only Be-
gotten of the Father, he must partake
of the *Substance* of the Father; and if
he partake of the *Substance* of the Father,
he must be *One* in *Substance* with the Fa-
ther; because the Divine *Substance* is but
One, as being Infinite and Indivisible.
To this Purpose we find the Learned
Bishop Pearson arguing strongly for the
Consubstantiality, “ Because the Divine
“ Nature, as it is absolutely Immate-
“ rial and Incorporeal, is also Indivisi-
“ ble, Christ cannot have any Part of
“ it

“ it only communicated unto him, but
 “ the Whole, by which he must be ac-
 “ knowledged Co-essential, of the same
 “ Substance with the Father; as the
 “ Council of *Nice* determined, and the
 “ ancient Fathers before them taught.
 “ Hence appeareth the Truth of these
 “ Words of our Saviour, which raised a
 “ Second Motion in the *Jews* to stone
 “ him; *I and my Father are One*: Joh. 10. 30.
 “ Where the Plurality of the *Verb*, and
 “ the Neutrality of the *Noun*, with the
 “ Distinction of their Persons, speak a
 “ Perfect *Identity* of their *Essence*. *”

UPON the Whole, when we consider
 that the denying One Substance in Num-
 ber was *Arius* his leading Fallacy; that
 the Identity of Substance or Essence was
 what the *Nicene* Fathers earnestly con-
 tended for, and what all Orthodox Di-
 vines do still harmoniously maintain;
 and when we consider, that tho’ the
 Persons of the Blessed Trinity are di-
 stinguished one from another by pro-
 per Characters; yet all the essential At-
 tributes of the Deity are common to
 them all, and the Divine Nature equal
 in them all: † That the Son is as truly
 and in all Respects as much our One

Q 3

God

* *Pearson* on the Creed, Page 135.

† *Bp. Bull’s Imp. Points of Prim. Christ.* Page 928. and
 some Pages before, maintains the Son’s Consubstantial-
 ity with the Father, and likewise his Co-eternity, and
 Equality to the Father, as to Nature and Essence. And
 Page

God, as the Father himself: And, that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, are One, True, Eternal, God: One Object of Faith, Worship and Adoration: And, that the Son, as begotten of the Father, must partake in some glorious inconceivable Manner, of the same Undivided or Individual Substance with the Father. We must, with the strongest Evidence conclude, and firmly believe, That *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*, are the *One Living and True God*, of One *Substance* or *Essence* in *Number*. We shall only add what is said in the Conclusion of the *Athanasian Creed*, "The *Godhead* of the *Father*, and of the *Son* is all *One*, the *Glory* *Equal*, the *Majesty* *Co-eternal*."

CHAP.

Page 926. he cites *Damasceus Lib. 3. Of the Orthodox Faith*, Cap. 5. discoursing thus of the Divine Persons: "We know, That they (the Persons) cannot depart or be separated from each other, and are united, and dwell in one another without Confusion. For tho' each Person is a perfect Subsistence, and has its own Property, that is, a different Manner of Existing, yet are they united in their *Essence*, and *Natural Properties*; and in as much as they are not separated, nor do withdraw from the Subsistence of the Father, they both are, and are said to be *One God*." *Hi tres, quia unus substantiæ sunt, unum sunt, ubi nulla naturarum, nulla est diversitas voluntatum.* Aug. Con. Max. L. 2. P. 691.

C H A P. VII.

Our Lord JESUS CHRIST the Supreme or Most High God.

ACCORDING to the Principles laid down in the Holy Scriptures, and even the common Dictates of Reason, whoever is truly and properly God, must be *Supreme*, as well as *Omnipotent*, *Omniscient*, or possessed of any other Divine Excellency; and a subordinate God is no *true* and *proper God* at all. One Way, in which the *Polytheism* of the *Pagan* World is exposed in Scripture, is, by representing the Weakness and Folly of any *subordinate Deities*, under One as *Supreme*. The common Language of the *True God* was this, *I am the Lord, and there is none else. There is no God besides me* *.

Isa. 45. 5.
Eccl. 44. 8.
Eccl. 46. 2.

THE venerable Assembly have found it relevant and proven against Mr. *Simson*, † That he had taught or vented, That the

G 4

* *Irenaeus* saith, " He that has any one above him, and is in the Power of another, can neither be said to be God, nor a great King." *Adv. Hares.* lib. 4. cap. 5.

† *Proceed. Ass.* 1728. P. 41.

the Terms *Supremus Deus*, Necessary Existence, &c. may be taken, and are, by some Authors, taken in a Sense, that includes the *Personal Property* of the Father, and so not belonging to the Son.

To the same Purpose, he says, in his Letter to the Presbytery of *Glasgow*, " When I had read in *Pictet*, *Christus est Summus Deus*, I said, It was to be understood *cum grano salis* *. Tho' I do not remember, that I then used this Expression; yet I think it is probable that I might, because I often use it on the like Occasions, namely, when a Term is not to be taken in the greatest Latitude, wherein it is used by some Authors. " It is very plain, That no Trinitarian, ascribing the Term, *Summus Deus*, in its greatest Latitude to the Son, did, at any Time, understand any more by it, than that the Son is *Very and Eternal God*, as well as the Father. It was never meant by it, That the Son was *Unbegotten*; so *Pictet* understands it. Why then did he give such a Caution, upon reading this Term in *Pictet*, unless he ascribes a *proper Supremacy* to the Father, and that in an higher Sense than any Orthodox Divine has ever done? If any sound Divine understood, by this Title, the *Personal*

Pro-

* *Star*, P. 19. Where he likewise supposes, That this Term may be taken in a Sense that includes the Father's Personal Property.

Property of the *Father*, yet all they meant by it, was, That the *Father* was *Unbegotten*, and the *First Person* in Order; as is evident from their maintaining the *Consubstantiality* and the *Necessary Existence* of the *Son*. But it is plain, That the Modern Refiners on the *Arian* Scheme understand something else; and that Mr. *Simson* doth so too, is evident not only from his Teaching, as above, an Use of the Term in its Latitude, wherein it agreeth to the *Father*, and not to the *Son*; but from his Definition of *Person*, his denying the *Necessary Existence* of the *Son*, and the *Numerical Oneness*. If the *Father* be a *Distinct Intelligent Agent* from the *Son*, and not the *same*, but *another Substance* in Number, and likewise the *Supreme God*, in a Sense in which the *Son* is not; he must be so in the highest Sense, in so far, that the *Father* would be God only and alone, in the proper Sense of the Word. According to our *Confession*, Ch. viii. § 2. The *Son* is *Very and Eternal God*, of *one Substance*, and *equal with the Father*. And therefore, according to the received Doctrine in this Church, the *Son* is the *Most High God*, as well as the *Father* *. And this Doctrine is founded upon the Holy Scriptures, and clearly revealed in them, as the Sequel will shew.

THE

* See likewise *Larg. Catech.* An. to Quest. 9.

THE *Son* is as truly, and in all Respects, as much our *One God*, as the *Father* himself; and therefore we cannot ascribe any proper Supremacy to the *Father*. The *Son* is One God with the *Father*; and therefore the *Most High God*, as well as the *Father*. If he has not the same Godhead with him, he has no proper Godhead at all. Altho' our Lord says, *My Father is greater than I*; yet it must be observed, That he does not say, *God is greater than I*, but my *Father* is so. For which Reason he plainly refers to his Mediatorship; tho' being in the Form of God, he thought it no Robbery to be equal with God; yet making himself of no Reputation, and taking upon him the Form of a Servant, on Purpose, that he might act the Part of a Mediator between his *Father* and sinful Men; He, in that Respect, without any Impeachment to his proper Divinity, might say his *Father* was greater: But still, as to Godhead, there was an Equality. Tho' the Son, in the Text * cited, owns the *Father* greater; he yet says elsewhere, *I and my Father are One*; which Declaration Hilary † opposes to the other, and that very justly: There can therefore be no greater Inequality

John 10.30.

* Hilary. de Trin. lib. 9. thus explains this Text, The *Father* (says he) is greater than the *Son*, considered as Man and Mediator.

† Vid. Hilary. de Trin. lib. 2. P. 21.

equality between them, than is consistent with an *Oneness* that is every Way peculiar. Had not an *Oneness* of Godhead and Divine Perfections been there meant, the *Jews* could never have thought *he made himself God* in pretending to it. Now, the Son could not be thus *One* with the *Father*, and yet the *Father* be greater than he was, as God. Our Lord also says, *All Things that the Father hath are mine* ||; so that he has all the Perfections and Rights, the same Nature and Godhead, the same Honour and Glory with the *Father*: He is therefore the *Most High God*, as well as the *Father*. The Ancients put this Saying of our Lord, upon the Foot of his Exinanition, whereby he did, for a Time, * lessen himself, and become inferior to *Himself*, to the *Father*, and *Holy Ghost*. Upon the whole, the Meaning of our Blessed Saviour's Words is plain and obvious; *If ye loved me, ye would rejoice, because I said, I go unto the Father, for my Father is greater than I now appear, or you apprehend me to be; as he, for the present, sustains the whole*
Cha-

|| Vid. Dr. Wat. Serm. on this Text. Serm. 6. P. 195.

* Propterea, Patrem dicere esse majorem, quia seipsum exinanivit, formam servi accipiens, non amittens Dei: Propter quam formam servi, non tantum Patre, verum etiam seipso, & Spiritu Sancto, minor factus est. Aug. Ep. 64. ad Max. As to other Objections against our Lord's Supreme Deity, see them answered by Dr. Watson, Dr. Calamy, Mr. Boyle, &c.

Character of the *Deity*, and I only that of *Mediator*.

THAT this High Character doth belong to Christ, shall be made evident from some Arguments grounded upon express Testimonies of Scripture, and by natural and easy Deductions from them.

I. NOT only do the Holy Scriptures ascribe to our Lord *Jesus*, the Title of the *Most High* *; but manifestly declare, that religious Worship and Adoration is to be paid to him; a most convincing Demonstration, that he is the most *High God*. To set this Argument in a true Light, it is only necessary to shew, that religious Worship, by the Holy Scriptures is appropriated to the *One most High God*: And that notwithstanding it is given to our Lord *Jesus Christ*, a plain Evidence that he is the *One, True and Supreme God*. That religious Worship is appropriated to the *One, True, and Most High God*, appears from that plain Precept, *Thou shalt have no other Gods before (or besides) me;* which is farther explain'd, (the Reason being the same, both with Respect to Images and false Gods,) *Thou shalt not bow down to them, nor serve them:* And elsewhere, *Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God;*

Luke 1. 76.

Exod. 20. 3.

Ver. 5.

Deut. 10. 20.

* Vid, *Leigh. Crit. Sac.* " The Names of the Father, " God Almighty, the *Most High*, The Lord of Hosts, " The King of *Israel*.-- belong to the Son likewise, all " that the Father hath, saith he, is mine; why not then " his Names? *Terrul. con. Prax. C. 17. cit. a Bull.*

God; him shalt thou serve, which is quoted and explained by our Blessed Lord himself, in these Words, *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.* This was said in answer to Satan, who did not pretend to be *Supreme*, all that he required, was, that an outward Act of Adoration should be paid him. And the Reason given for refusing it, is not that he was a bad Spirit, or that God had not commanded that he should be worshipped; but the Reason is General, that none are to be worshipped but God only. And that these and the like Texts were intended to exclude all Beings, beside the *One, True, and Most High God* from being worshipped, appears not only from the Reason of the Thing, but from plain Texts of Scripture. *Before me was there no God formed, neither shall there be after me. If there arise among you a Prophet, and giveth thee a Sign, and the Sign come to pass, — saying, Let us go after other Gods and serve them, — thou shalt not hearken.* The Worship of the *One Most High God*, exclusive of all others, is by this for ever made *Unchangeable*. Miracles could not be sufficient to give Credit to any One, who would pretend to introduce another Object of Worship. The Nature of religious Worship is an owning the Object we worship to have all Divine Perfections: 'Tis an Ascription of

Matth. 4.
10.

Isa. 43. 10.

Deut. 18.
1, 2, 3.

of these to the Object, adoring him, submitting to him, depending on him, trusting in him, seeking from him all we want, giving him the sole Praise of what we have, dedicating our Selves and our all to him. Hence the Apostle condemns those who *did Service to them which by Nature are no Gods*. And intimates, that the Idolatry of the Heathens lay in their worshipping of the Creature, and not the Creator only, the Most High God. The Angel (*Rev. 19.*) refused to receive so much as the outward Act of Adoration, giving this Rule upon it, *worship God*, intimating thereby, that God only is to be worshipped. From all which it is manifest, that by the Scriptures all religious Worship is declared to belong to the * *One True, and Most High God*, and to him only; and that upon such Reasons as exclude all Creature-worship; namely, because he is *God, Jehovah, Eternal, Immutable; Creator, Preserver, Sustainer, and Governor* of all Things. God himself hath fixed the Sense and Meaning of religious Worship: It means by Divine Institution and Appointment, the Divinity,

* Θεον μὲν μόνον προσκυνῶμεν *Iust. Mart. Ap. 1. C. 31.*
Θεῷ δὲ τῷ οὕτως Θεῷ καὶ ἀλλοῖς προσκυνῶ --- οὐκ ἄλλο
εἶναι εἰ --- προσκυνεῖσθαι ἀλλ' ἡ μόνον Θεῷ. *Theophi. P. 30.*
33. Quod colimus Deus unus est. *Iertul. Ap. C. 17.* Do-
minum Deum tuum adorare oportet, & ipsi soli servire,
Irenæus P. 320. Vid. Clem. Alex. P. 55. & Orig. 6. c. 64.
P. 158.

[III]

vinity, the *Supremacy*, the *Sovereignty* of its Object; to misapply those Marks of Dignity, those appropriate Ensigns of Divine Majesty, is to make Common what God has made proper, is to deify the Works of God's Hands, and to serve the Creature instead of the Creator, *God blessed for ever.* To all which I might add, that all the Catholick Writers before the Council of Nice (if we may believe the * Learned), unanimously agree in this, as an indisputable Point, that the *supreme God alone* is to be worshipped; and always urged it with equal Zeal and Success against Pagan Idolatry and Superstition. That religious Worship appropriate to the Most *High God*, has been in all Ages of the Church given to the Son, is very manifest; he had distinct Worship paid to him in his own Person, long before his Incarnation. *It is the unanimous Opinion of all Antiquity,* (says Doctor Clark) *that the Angel who appeared to Moses in a Flame of Fire in a Bush, and said, I am the God of thy Fathers, — was Christ †.* This same Person then, allowed on all Hands to be *Christ*, demanded of *Moses* a signal Instance of Divine Homage, when he said to him, *Put off thy Shoes from off thy Feet, for the*

* Bull Prim. Trad. P. 3.

† D. Clark. Serip. Doct. P. 114. as to his Pretence that the Son spake in the Person of the Father, this has been confuted by D. Waterland Dis. P. 33.

the Place whereon thou standest is holy Ground; made so by the special Presence of the Speaker, the Most High God. For as none but the Supreme God is to be worshipped; so no Deprivation from the Most High God, nor any Thing short of the peculiar Manifestation of a Divine Person, can immediately turn a Field or a Mountain into a Chapel.

Notwithstanding of what * some have pretended, it can be evinc'd that he was worshipped under the Old Testament, in the Capacity of Creator. To this Purpose is that Passage of the Psalmist, cited by the Apostle Paul, and expressly ascribed by him to our Saviour, *I said, O my God, take me not away in the midst of my Days; thy Years are throughout all Generations. Of Old hast thou laid the Foundation of the Earth, and the Heavens are the Work of thine Hands.* † I mention the former Verse, (which is not quoted by the Apostle) only to shew, that the Person addressed to here, under the Title of *O my God*, is the same Person that is praised or invoked in the latter Verse, as the Founder or Creator of the Earth and the Heavens.

There is no one Act of Worship, that is in the Holy Scriptures ascribed to the Father, that is not also ascribed to

* Most Plea. p. 58.

† See Dr. Knight's Sermons p. 53. for a fuller Proof that the Apostle intended this Passage of the

to the Son. Is the Father to be called upon, and religiously invocated for all needful Supplies of Grace? So also is the Son, as appears from the Texts on the Margin. Must the Father have inward Worship and Veneration? So also should the Son. Is the Father to be believed in or trusted? So also is the Son. Is the Father to be lov'd supremely? So also is the Son; whom we are to love more than life itself. Are we to resign our Wills to the Will of the Father, and live to his Glory as our End? The like is also required as to the Son. We are to live to him, who died for us. Is the Father to have Praise and Thanksgiving return'd him? 'Tis the same with the Son: Hence it is, that we, in the New Testament, have such Variety of Doxologies to the Son as well as the Father; which are a Part of the Worship here on Earth; and we have Intimations given us of a like Worship in Heaven above, where Blessing, and Honour, and Glory, and Power, are joyntly ascrib'd unto him that sitteth on the Throne, and unto the Lamb, and that for ever and ever. Is the Father to be prayed to? So also is the Son. The whole Canon of Scripture is clos'd with a direct Address to Christ, in these Words, *Amen, even so, Come Lord Jesus*. An higher Homage cannot be paid to any One as the Supreme God, than has been done to our

Acts 4.
1 Cor. 1. 31

Rom. 10.
11. 13. 24.
John 14.
1.

Mat. 11. 28.
2 Cor. 13.

Acts 7. 59.
2 Cor. 13.
7. 8. 9.

H

Lord

Lord Jesus, by the whole Church, from Age to Age, and that by Divine Appointment, in the Two *Sacraments* of the *New Testament*.

ALL acknowledge that Worship to be *sovereign* and *supreme*, that is paid directly to the *Father*; and since the very same is here paid to the *Son*, how can we imagine it to be less than *supreme*? If it be alledged, that Divine Worship is paid to the *Son* on the sole Account of his *Mediatorship*: It is own'd, that he ought to be worshipped on Account of his *Mediatorship*; but, that he is worshipped only on that Account, it is denied. The Angels, who have no Interest in Christ, as *Mediator*, are represented as paying the very same Divine Honour and Worship to the *Son*, as they do to the *Father*. And there are three Instances of Invocation in the *New Testament*, directed immediately to Christ, --- *Thou, Lord, which knowest the Hearts of all Men. Thou, Lord, in the Beginning, hast laid the Foundation of the Earth. Lord, lay not this Sin to their Charge.* The very Matter, in each of these Addresses to *Christ*, most evidently shews, that he was not worshipped barely as *Mediator*, but as the *Searcher of Hearts*; as the *Creator of the Universe*; as the *God who alone can forgive Sins*. And when we pray to the *Father* through, or in the Name of the *Son*, we are so

Acts 1. 24.
Hebr. 1. 10.
Acts 7. 60.

far from paying a *mediate* or diminutive Worship to the Son, that, on the contrary, we plead his infinite Dignity, and offer the infinite Satisfaction he has made for us to the Father. And this is so far from lessening, that it magnifies the Dignity and Excellency of Christ's Person and *Sufferings*, which are so infinitely available, and so *omnipotent*, as to bring together and reconcile two the most distant Things in the World, a *Pure God*, and a *sinful Creature*. And when we pray to Christ as *Mediator*, we must consider him as an *omniscient*, *omnipresent* Being; without which our Prayer would be turned into Sin. And is it possible, with such Thoughts as these about us, to pay him a *mediate* or inferior Worship? Neither is the Worship paid to Christ ultimately referred to the *Father*; since all Things were created by the Son as the efficient Cause, and for him as the final Cause, (*Col. 1. 16.*) It is plain from hence, that rational Creatures may *finally* and *ultimately* worship the Son of God, by whom, and for whose Service and Glory, the said Creatures were made. Nor is this Worship due to him only in Virtue of a Divine Command: For we have likewise a Divine Command for worshipping the Father; and yet this is not the sole Ground of the Worship we pay him. We have shown, that Divine

Worship is appropriated to the *One, True, and Most High God*; and since we are commanded to worship Christ, it shews, that he is the *True, Supreme God*: Divine Worship is due to him therefore, not only because commanded; but it is commanded, because it is his unalienable Right.

To all which, I might add what the Learned Dr. *Waterland* observes *,
 “ That the Ancients expressly assert the
 “ Son’s Right and Title to Religious
 “ Worship; particularly *Origen* †, in
 “ his Book against *Celsus*, the most va-
 “ luable of all his Works, asserts the
 “ Son to have the fullest Right and Ti-
 “ tle to Religious Worship. He speaks
 “ of his being worshipped as God by
 “ the *Magi*, and calls it *Εὐσεβεία*, the
 “ very same Word which he uses, spea-
 “ king of the Worship due to the Fa-
 “ ther. He (*Origen*) speaks of worship-
 “ ping Father and Son joyntly as *One*
 “ *God*, and mentions the Worship of
 “ the Son, in his distinct *Personal Capa-*
 “ *city*. And since the Son is to be wor-
 “ shipped, it must be with Supreme
 “ Worship, due to the *One Supreme*
 “ *God*: Because there is no possible
 “ Room left in Scripture for that ab-
 “ surd Distinction || betwixt Sovereign
 “ and

* Dr. *Water.* 1. Def. † *Origen*, cont. *Col.* P. 46, 160, 326, 238, 239. cit. a *Wat. Vid. Just. Mart.* Ap. 1. P. 11. *Tertul.* Ap. C. 21, *Clem. Alex.* P. 311, cit. *Ibid.* † *Ibid.*

“ and Inferior Adoration. Inferior or
 “ relative Worship appears to be a plain
 “ Contradiction in Sense, as it is *novel*
 “ in Sound, like an inferior or relative
 “ God.” Now, Religious Worship be-
 ing required, and offered to the *Most*
High God alone, not for recognizing the
 personal Properties of the *Father*, but
 the *essential* Perfections of the *Deity*, ‡
 common to all the *Persons* of the *Elessed*
Trinity; seeing, that Divine Worship,
 properly so called, is in every Kind and
 Degree incommunicably due to the *Sup-*
reme God alone, by a fundamental Ma-
 xim of *Law* and *Gospel*, by the constant
 Doctrine of *Moses* and the *Prophets*, of
Christ and his *Apostles*, and of the whole
 Catholick Church in every Age; and
 it being intirely repugnant to the Na-
 ture, Reason and Truth of Things, to
 suppose two different Objects of Wor-
 ship, the one, in *some Sense*, a *Supreme*,
 the other, in *some Sense*, an *Inferior Be-*
ing or *Substance*; and since, neverthe-
 less, we find, That the highest Kind
 and Degree of Worship, even the Wor-
 ship of *Latria*, has, from the Beginning,
 been actually ascrib'd to our *Saviour*,
 that he was worshipped before his *In-*
carnation, and will be after the ceasing

H 3

of

‡ Non potest Deus cuiquam divinum cultum commu-
 nicare, cui non & naturam atque excellentiam divinam
 (cujus nulla creatura capax est) largiatur. *Bald's Prim.*
Trad. Page 26.

of his Mediatorial Kingdom *; and seeing the Inspired Writers have asserted his Divine Right to *supreme* Worship, on the same solid Grounds upon which the *Father's* Title to Worship is founded; and since an *Identity of Worship* does necessarily infer an *Equality of Nature*: It is very manifest from the whole, That the *Son of God* is of the same undivided Nature and Substance with the *Father*, Inseparable from him, in Glory Equal †, and in Majesty Co-eternal; and, that He is the *One, True, Supreme or Most High God*, as well as the *Father*.

II. THE *supreme Deity* of our Lord Jesus Christ may be clearly evinced from his *supreme Dominion*, whether *Oeconomical*, or *Natural*. *Christ*, considered as *Mediator*, is constituted by the *Father* Supreme Governor of the World; but this he could not have been, if he were not the *True and Most High God*, as well as *Man*, antecedently qualified, by his proper Divinity, for the full Exercise of his High Office and Regal Authority. And tho' the *Mode* of *Christ's* Dominion will hereafter be changed; yet the Glory, the Beatitude, and the Majesty of it shall never pass away. When he shall have delivered up the Kingdom

* See to this Purpose, the Learned Mr. *Johnson*, Ser. 1. P. 37. And *Gull's Prim. Trad.* P. 37 cit. a *Johns.* Ibid.

† Deus quamvis omnipotens, non potuit vel inæqualem sibi gignere Filium, vel æqualem condere creaturam. *Bernard.*

Kingdom to the Father, as God-Man, he shall * continue, even then, sitting upon his Father's Throne, and receive the Praises and Adorations of his ransomed Ones. As *Son of God*, he will *subsist in the Form of God*, and, together with the *Father* and the *Holy Ghost*, be acknowledged and adored by all the Host of Heaven, to all Eternity. But seeing, in the present Administration of his Kingdom, "*All Power, in the ultimate Extent of its Infinity, is given unto him†;*" and since the Kingdom is not yet resign'd, nor the *Son* now subject to the *Father*; *Supremacy* of Dominion, even in this Respect, which some pretend is the *peculiar Mark* of the *One Supreme God*, must certainly belong to the *Son*.

OUR Blessed Saviour may, by an easy and natural Deduction, be clearly proved to be *naturally Supreme* Governor of the World: For, as that learned Author, Mr. *Johnson*, has well observed ||, "He is often stiled *Jehovah*, the proper, peculiar, and incommunicable Name of the *Most High God*,"

H 4

" im-

* "He shall reign---to the complete Eternity of the Duration of his Humanity, which, for the future, is co-eternal to his Divinity---The ancient Fathers added these Words to the *Nicene Creed*, *Whose Kingdom shall have no End*, against the Heresy of *Marcellus*, denying the Eternity of Christ's Kingdom. *Pearson* on the Creed, P. 283.

† Ibid.

|| Mr. *Johnson*, *Supreme Dominion of the Son*, *Serm.* 3. P. 4, 5, 9.

“ importing *Necessary Existence*, and
 “ absolute *Independent Being*, the Foun-
 “ tain and Foundation of all that is or
 “ can be: And must therefore have, in
 “ himself, the Ground of all Dominion
 “ whatsoever, and be capable, *per se*,
 “ of governing a whole World of Crea-
 “ tures. And since he is evidently de-
 “ clared in Scripture to be the Cre-
 “ ator of the Universe, he must have a
 “ natural Right to govern whatever
 “ he hath created. And seeing he is
 “ stiled, in the *Old Testament*, *The Lord*
 “ *of Hosts*, the King of Glory; it is
 “ evident, That, before his Incarnation
 “ he had *Supreme Dominion* in the high-
 “ est *Heavens*, and that his Authority
 “ there was equal to the *Father's*. ”

To prove Christ *Mediator*, is to prove
 him *God*; to prove his *Oeconomical Su-*
*premac*y, is to demonstrate, at the same
 Time, his *Essential Divinity*. Christ, as
Mediator, had not been capable of an
Oeconomical Supremacy, if he had not,
 as *God*, been *naturally Supreme* Gover-
 nor of the World *. Upon the whole,
 it is very manifest, That, since *Supreme*
Dominion, both *Oeconomical* and *Natural*,
 are ascribed to our Lord Jesus Christ
 in the Holy Scriptures, he must be ac-
 knowledged to be the *One, True, Supreme,*
 or *Most High God*.

III. THE

* See this abundantly proved by Mr. Johnson, *Serm. 2.*
 on the *Son's Dominion*, P. 33.

III. THE Apostle Paul expressly asserts, That our Lord Jesus Christ is the *Supreme Being*, than whom there is none *Greater*. For (saith he) *When* Heb. 6. 13,
God made Promise to Abraham, because 14.
he could swear by no greater, he swore by
himself, saying, Surely, blessing, I will
bless thee—The Passage in the *Old Te-*
stament, to which the Apostle here plain-
 ly alludes, is as follows—*And the Angel*
of the Lord called unto him, out of Hea-
ven, and said—Now I know that thou
fear'st God, seeing thou hast not withheld Gen. 22. 17,
thy Son, thine only Son from me—*And* 12, 15, 16,
the Angel of the Lord called unto Abra- 17.
ham out of Heaven the second Time, and
said, By my self have I sworn, saith the
Lord, For because thou hast done this
thing, and hast not withheld thy Son,
thine only Son, that in blessing, I will
bless thee. The Apostle expressly declares
 of the *Person* that made this Promise to
 Abraham, That, *because he could swear*
by no greater, he swore by himself: And
 since he could swear by no greater, 'tis
 undeniably clear, that he must be *Su-*
preme.

THIS Angel of the Lord could not
 be the *Father*, who is no where called
 an Angel. An Angel is sent, and his
 Office is *Ministerial*, which cannot be
 applied to the *Father*. This Angel con-
 descended sometimes to take on him
 human

human Shape, which we have no Reason to believe the *Father* ever did.

Rev. 10.
5, 6.

THIS Angel of the Lord could not be a created Angel, who when he swear-eth, he swears always by one greater than himself.

NOR is this Angel of the Lord to be understood of the *Person* of the *Son* representing the *Supreme Person* of the *Father* (as *Dr. Clark* speaks.) For tho' an Ambassador, having first declared that he is sent, and from whom, may act in the Name, and by the Authority of another, but cannot speak as if he were the Monarch that sent him; it were absurd, yea treasonable, for him to say, *I am the King*: But here no such Declaration is made, and so no Provision laid in against *Idolatri*. For, when one speaks in the Name of God, not as from God, but as God, and as the *Most High God*, who would judge but religious Worship were to be given to him? which is not to be given to any but the *Supreme Being*, as we have seen above. But the Angel here speaks, not in the Name of God, or from God, but as the *Most High God*, *Thou hast not withhold thine only Son from me*; and, *Blessing, I will bless thee*; (an * *Hebraism* vehemently affirming the Thing promised, and extending the Matter promised)

I will

* Vid. *Dr. Owen* on *Hib. 6. 13.*

*a case of Speakers
is not of Supreme Being*

I will bless thee, certainly, without Fail, greatly, without Measure; and eternally, without End; in such a Manner, that, in thy Seed, all the Nations of the Earth shall be *blessed*. And he is called, *Θεός*, * by the Apostle, with the prefix'd Article, which, they say, is always understood of the *Supreme God*, and cannot therefore be applied to any that represents him. Farther, *He swears by himself*; (and not by a greater Person represented by him) the Apostle gives the Reason, *because he could by no greater*: Wherefore there is no *Being* greater than the *Son of God*; and therefore he is the *Supreme Being*, the most *Highb God*. Dr. *Waterland* has demonstrated, That the Ancients, (such as *Tertullian*, *Theophilus Anti. Clement*, *Justin Martyr*) ever look'd upon the *Son*, as the God of the *Jews*, the God of *Abraham*, *Isaac*, and *Jacob*†; and that it is the Opinion of these early Writers, That *Christ* appeared and spake in his own Person, who, being really God, might, in his own Right, truly and

* Θεός is sometimes the rendring of *Jehovah*. As to the Objection founded on these Words, *Saith the Lord*, it is replied, These may be the Words of *Mosés*, shewing, for the Support of Faith, That he who interposed the Oath, was so the Angel of the Lord, as to be the *Jehovah*; and such Words are often used in the Third Person, when God himself is the Speaker. *Jer.* 1. 19. *2. 12.* *Zech.* 2. 8, 9. He is said to speak from Heaven, which is a Description of God. *Hab.* 12. 12.

† Dr. *Wat.* Def. P. 33, 34.

and justly assume those high Titles and yet, designing, in his own due Time, to take human Nature upon him might more suitably condescend to a ministerially among Men, a proper Prelude to his Incarnation, and so might be not only *God*, but an *Angel* too.

Gen. 1. 1, 2. If we take but a passing View of his different Appearances to the *Patriarchs* we may observe, in each of them, convincing Evidences of his *True* and *Supreme Deity*. It is not improbable, that it was our *glorious Immanuel*, the Second Person of the *Godhead*, who, as the Angel of the Lord, did, in some especial Manner, appear to our First Parents and carried to them the comfortable Message of God's Grace and Good-Will towards Men *, who is there called *Jehovah Elobim*, which are the eminent Titles of the *Most High God*.

Gen. 12. A.Q. 7. He is the *God of Glory* who appeared to *Abraham*, * when he was in *Mesopotamia*, before he dwelt in *Charran*, who entered into Covenant with him, and blessed him; hence *Melchizedek* pronounced him blessed of the *most High God*. He appeared again to him in the plains of *Mamre*; *Abraham* worshipped him, calling him *Jehovah*, and the Judge of all the Earth; which are

* Dr. Owen on the *Heb.* 5. 1. *Exod.* 16. Vid. *Tertul.* adv. *Prax.* cap. 16.

* Vid. *Zanchi de Triu. Elobim.* in *Gen.* 12.

are manifest Characters of the most High God. He met *Jacob* at *Peniel* in the Day of his Distress, as a Man in Appearance, an *Angel* in Office, and yet in Name and Nature, *God over all blessed for ever*. He blesseth *Jacob* at his importunate Desire, from hence *Jacob* concludes that he had seen God, and calls the Name of the Place *Peniel*, i. e. the Face of God. He is styl'd the God of *Beth-el* to whom *Jacob* built an Altar, and vowed a Vow, *That the Lord should be his God*. And *Jacob*, when a dying, invokes this *Angel*, who had redeem'd him from all Evil, the God who had fed him all his Days, for his Presence with, and his Blessing upon, the Children of *Joseph*, all which cannot regard any but the most High God, without gross Idolatry.

HE is the *Angel* of the Lord who appeared to *Moses*, at *Horeb*, in a Flame of Fire, out of the midst of a Bush. He received and required Religious Worship from *Moses*; he is called *Jehovah*, and assumes to himself the Character of Deliverer of his People, of the God of *Abraham*; he describes himself by that glorious Name, *I am that I am*. In his Name and Authority *Moses* dealt with *Pharaoh* in their Deliverance.

Him

† This Text Gen. 31. 13. is applied to the Person of the Son, by *Just. Mart.* Pag. 216. by *Novat. C.* 27. and *Chrys. Al.*

Him they were to serve upon that Mountain upon their coming out of Egypt; and *His merciful Good-will, Moses Prays for, towards that People: All which demonstrate him to be the most High God* *.

Deut. 33. 16. HE demanded and received Divine Worship from *Joshua*; and received a Burnt-offering and a Meat-offering from *Manoah* and his Wife. He is the *Angel*

Exod. 23. 20, 21, 22. that went in the midst of the People in the Wilderness, whose Glory appear'd and was manifested among them, as the Glory of the *God of Israel*. And he is the *Angel* of the Lord, who gave the Law at Mount *Sinai*, and who said

Exod. 19. 20, & 20, 2. in his own Person †; *I am the Lord thy God, who brought thee out of the Land of Egypt, out of the House of Bondage*. Now if we consider the eminent Titles ascribed to the *Blessed Jesus*,

Psal. 68. 16. the *Angel* and *Messenger* of the *Covenant*; the *Homage* and *Adoration* paid him; the unanimous Consent of the *Ancients*, both

* Ipse igitur Christus cum Patre vivorum est Deus, qui locutus est Moyse, qui & Patribus manifestatus est. Iren. L. 4. C. 5. Pag. 232. & Tertul. cont. Prax. C. 16.

Νεγονατς θρι --- You have seen that the same Person, whom Moses calls an *Angel*, and who conversed with him in the flame of Fire, that very Person being God, signifies to Moses that himself is the God of *Abraham*. --- Justin. Martyr. Dial. Pag. 220.

† Clement of Alexandria citing Exod. 20. 2. *I am the Lord thy God*, understanding it of *Christ*, observes particularly, that *Christ* said this of himself in his own Person. Clem. Alex. P&id; L. i. C. 7. P. 131. Ed. Qz.

both *Jews* * and *Christians*, who understood this *Angel* of the *Messiah* appearing and acting in his own Name and Person; and considering, that he that hath any one above him, cannot be said to be God †; and that the Son is said to be, and therefore is *God over all* ‡; and that the Apostle expressly declareth, that *because he could swear by no greater, he swore by Himself*; and further, that his swearing by himself, in the Nature of the Thing, plainly supposeth, that he had no greater Being to swear by: We must with irresistible Evidence deduce this Conclusion, That he is the *Supreme Being*; the *One, True, and Most High God* ||, as well as the *Father*.

CON-

* Angelus, si rem ipsam dicamus, est Angelus Redemptor, de quo Scriptum est, quoniam nomen meum in ipso est, ille, inquam, Angelus, qui ad Jacob dicebat, ego Deus Beth-el, ille de quo dictum est, Exod. 3. 4. & vocabat Moysen Deus de rubo. Scriptum est enim, Deut. 6. 21. Eduxit vos Jehovah ex Aegypto. Et alibi, Num. 20. 6. Misit Angelum suum & eduxit vos ex Aegypto. Preterea scriptum est, Isa. 63. 9. Et Angelus faciei ejus salvos fecit ipsos. Nimirum ille Angelus, qui est Dei facies, de quo dictum est, Exod. 33. 14. Facies mea praeibit, & efficiam ut quiescas. De quo Vates, Mal. 3. 1. De quo dictum est. — Nomen meum in eo est. Rabbi Moses, Bar. Nachman. In Exod. 23. ὁ δὲ ἀγγελὸς τοῦ Πατρὸς ὁ ὢν ἐστὶν, αὐτὸς Κύριος καὶ Θεὸς ὢν. Anti Ep.

† Irenaeus saith, That he that hath any one above him, can neither be said to be God, nor a great King.

‡ Origen in Rom. L. 7. C. 9. affirms, "That Christ is God over all," and adds, "That he that is over all, has no one above him."

|| To say that Christ is God, but not the *Most High God*, is all one as to say, He is God, but not the *Most Holy God*, or not the *True God*, and so to bring him in amongst the Number of false Gods. Vid. Dr. Owen Doct. Trin. Vind. P. 42.



CONCLUSION.

THE Sum then, of what has been said, and made good by Scriptural Proof, is, *That our Lord Jesus Christ is called God*, and that in such a Manner, as by that Name no other can be understood, but the *One, Only, True, and Supreme God*. That *He is the Only True God*; because the Attributes which belong *only to God*, (and which are therefore undoubtedly *Infinite*) belong to him also; and the Works peculiar to the *Only True God*, are ascribed to him in Scripture as the *efficient Cause*. That *He is One, True, Eternal God with the Father*, as having the same *Godhead or Divine Nature*, as *he is so the only Begotten Son of the Father*, as to *be of the same Substance with him, of Glory Equal, of Majesty Co-eternal**; and as he is with the Father *One Object of Faith, Religious Worship and Adoration*; *that he is Independent and Self-Existent*, as being *Alpha and Omega*, before whom no Being existed; as being *Jehovah*, that is, *Being it self*, and the *Origin of all Things*.

* Bp. Pearson on the Creed expresseth himself as follows, --- Art. 2. Pag. 144.

Things; and as being *always Son* of the *Father*, who was *always Father*; and therefore could have no Beginning of Being, and therefore is a *Beginningless Being*. That *He is a Necessary Being*; as having all Things that the *Father* hath, all the *Essential Perfections* of the *Deity*, and therefore *Necessary-Existence* and *Independence*; as being *absolutely Eternal*, and therefore *Necessarily Existent*; as being the *Creator* of the *Universe*, the *Fountain* of all *Being*, and therefore a *Necessary-Being*. And that *he is the Supreme or most high God*; Jo. 3. 31. as having no *Being* above him, because *He is above all*; as having *Religious Worship* and *Adoration* paid him, by *Angels* and *Men*, by the *Church Militant* and *Triumphant*, (as set down with the *Father* in *this Throne*) which, in the *Nature* of the *Thing*, and by the *Holy Scriptures*, is appropriate to the *Supreme or most High God* alone; as a *Being* so infinitely *Great*, that he could not possibly swear by a *Greater*, wherefore he is the *Greatest*, the *Supreme Being*, *God over all*, *Blessed for ever*. Amen.

From all which, it may in a natural and easy Manner, be deduced by way of *Corollary*.

I

THAT

† Mr. Johnson. *Serm. 3. on Christ's Dominion. P. 36.* cites this Observation of the *Learned Mede*. "Here are two Thrones mentioned, my Throne says Christ, — glorified Saints sit with him in his Throne. But my Father's (i. e. Gods) Throne, is the Power of Divine Majesty."

THAT these Propositions, viz. I. That our Lord Jesus Christ is not *Necessarily-Existent*: That the necessary Existence of our Lord Jesus Christ is a Thing we know not: That the Term *Necessary-Existence* is impertinent, and not to be used in talking of the *Trinity*: That the Three *Persons* of the *Trinity* are not to be said to be numerically *One* in *Substance* or *Essence*: That the Terms *Necessary-Existence*, *Supremus Deus*, and the Title of the *Only True God*, may be taken in a Sense that includes the *Personal Property* of the *Father*, and so not belonging to the *Son*: Found relevant and proven against Mr. *Simson* by the *Assemblies* of this Church, are grossly *Erroneous*, contrary to the Holy Scriptures, and our *Confession of Faith* and *Catechisms*: And as, such ought to be expressly and particularly condemned. And that, in Opposition to these blasphemous Errors, The *Independency*, *Necessary-Existence*, and *Necessary Generation* of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, the *Eternal Son* of God, should be expressly asserted: And that it ought to be declared by this Church, That the Terms *Necessary-Existence*, *Supreme* or *most High God*, and the Title of the *only true God*, do all equally belong to, and are to be affirmed of the *Son* and *Holy Ghost*, as well as of the *Father*.

II. THAT

II. THAT the Deity ascrib'd to the Son in the Holy Scriptures, carries in it not only bare *Power* and *Dominion*, but all other *Essential* Perfections of the *Deity*; That there must be a great Difference between his *Deity*, which is Natural and Essential to him, and his *Mediatorship* which is superadded: And that therefore to ascribe those Things to him as *God*, which are spoken of him as *Mediator*, and to draw Inferences with respect to his *Deity*, from what relates to his *Mediatorial* Office, is very Fallacious, and instead of helping to clear Matters, tends to nothing but Confusion. And that the *Deity* ascrib'd to the *Son*, in Scripture, carries in it an *Equality* to the *Father* in Nature, Attributes and Perfections, without any Inferiority to him in either.

III. THAT we ought to *honour* the *Son*, even as we *honour* the *Father*, and reckon we detract from both, when we lessen either. And that we are not to think less *Honour* due to the Blessed *Spirit*, than either to the *Father* or the *Son*, since we were as truly and as solemnly devoted to him in our *Baptism* as to either of them. It was a needful Caution that was given by *Hilary* * one of the earliest Christian Writers upon the Subject of the *Trinity* we have now remaining; who when he was dealing

* *Hilar. Lib. 3. de Trinit. P. 35.*

with the *Arians*, tells us, *That we must take heed, lest under Pretence of honouring the Father, we lessen the Glory of the Son.*

IV. That we ought earnestly to contend for the Doctrine of Christ's *true, proper and supreme Deity*, as the most *Fundamental* Point of all Christianity. Let any here run into Mistakes, and the whole Scheme of our Religion is presently affected. Let *Father and Son* be Equal, and there is Room for a Compact. The assuming human Flesh, will then be an Act of the most surprising Condescension; and Redeeming Love, will be found to have an ineffable Aptness to excite a Love in some Measure suitable in Return. There will be one capable of giving, and another of receiving *Satisfaction*; I mean, such a Satisfaction as is as estimable, in the Nature of Obedience, as the Injury which the Great God received was, in the Nature of Contempt. But, if Men once call Christ's *Proper Deity* into Question, they presently run into mistaken Notions about his *Incarnation*, and about the whole Work of *Redemption*; and quite overturn the Doctrine of *Satisfaction*, together with what depends upon it. And if they have low Thoughts of the *Person of Christ*, it is not to be wonder'd if they make Light of his *Grace*. It is not at all to be expected, That Men should have

have better Thoughts of the *Holy Spirit*, than of the *Son of God*: Therefore we need not wonder, that they who stumble at the *Son's Deity*, are against the *Deity of the Holy Ghost* too, and quite to seek about his Operations, and particularly that sanctifying Work of his, that is in the Sacred Scriptures represented as so absolutely necessary to Salvation.

V. THAT we may, with the greatest Security, *trust* and *confide* in him by Faith, as the *Great God* and our *Saviour*, expecting eternal Life from his Hands: For the *Incarnation* of the *Son of God*; the *Obedience* he perform'd, and the *Satisfaction* he made in a *Publick Capacity*, have tended to, and issued in an entire Vindication of the Glory of all the Divine Attributes. What more could Justice require, or Mercy bestow, than the only Begotten Son of God? What greater Love could God shew to Sinners, than by *providing*? What greater Hatred to Sin, than by *demanding* a Sacrifice of such Infinite Value? How gloriously does the Divine Wisdom appear, in bringing about the most noble End, the Glory of God, and the Salvation of Men, by the most opposite Means, in human Appearance, the *Humiliation of the Son of God*? What an unfathomable Depth of Wisdom did it require, to find out an Expedient to punish

nish Sin, and, at the same Time, pardon the Sinner; and so reconcile infinite Mercy with inflexible Justice? Our Thoughts are quite swallowed up in this unfathomable *Mystery*. For, that wretched Man should sin against his Maker, and the Creator of all Things take upon him the Sinner's Punishment; That God the Father should give his Co-eternal and Consubstantial Son for the Redemption of his apostate Creatures; That God the Son should freely offer himself a Ransom, and voluntarily undergo the full Stroke of Divine Vengeance due to an Elect World; That the Great and Mighty God should bow the Heavens and come down, and Veil himself in a Tabernacle of Flesh; That the Ancient of Days should become an Infant of Days, should be subject to all the Miseries and Infirmities of human Life, and, at last, to suffer a most painful and accursed Death; What a Miracle of Love and Condescension is here! Did we not believe the *proper Deity* of the Son, this would make the whole such a dark *Mystery*, as would serve only to eclipse the Glory of the Divine Perfections, and to lessen our Gratitude to our God and Saviour. But when we consider Christ, as perfect God, and perfect Man, substantially united in one Person; This fills us with awful and worthy

thy Apprehensions of God, in this, the chiefest of all his Works, this adorable Dispensation. This doth shew such an Excellency and Dignity in the Person of the Mediator, as will assure us of an infinite Efficacy in his Actions, and Value in his Sufferings. Seeing by every Sin we have offended God, who is of infinite Eminency, according unto which the Injury is aggravated; how shall we ever be secure of our Reconciliation unto God, except the Person who hath undertaken to make the Reparation be of the same infinite Dignity; so as the Honour rendred by his Obedience may prove proportionable to the Offence, and that Dishonour which arose from our Disobedience? This Scruple is no otherwise to be satisfied, than by a Belief in such a Mediator as is the only Begotten Son of God, of the same Substance with the Father, and consequently, of the same Power and Dignity with the God whom by our Sins we have offended.

LET it therefore be our earnest Request, when we are looking upward with the greatest Seriousness, That we may, by Faith, be implanted into *Christ Jesus*, who is the Author, Purchaser and Donor of *Eternal Life*; and who, therefore, and upon that Account, necessarily, must be the *True God*. And
let

11/60

M/-

[136]

let it be our daily Study, by New Sup-
plies of his Grace, *To live to him, who*
died for us, that we which live, should
not henceforth live unto our selves, but
unto him who died for us, and rose a-
gain.

Now, to God the Father, Son, and
Holy Ghost, Three Persons and
One God, be ascribed, in all Churches
of the Saints, all Honour and
Glory, Adoration and Thanksgi-
ving, now and for evermore.
Amen.

F I N I S.



ERRATA.

PAGE 8. Line 9. for Gods read God. P. 19. L. 1.
read given him. Ibid. L. 28. for Seal read Seat.
P. 16. in the Notes, L. 5. for Pulther read Pulcher. P. 17.
Notes, L. 9. read 'Apyayov. P. 19. L. 19. read inef-
fable. P. 42. L. 7. read posteriori. P. 43. L. 9. read And
that. P. 50. for since read therefore. P. 51. L. 26. read is
the. P. 52. L. 28. after Communication read here. Ibid.
L. 32. del. which. and L. 29. after therefore read to have.
P. 123. L. 13. after could read swear. Ibid. L. 19. del. Ant.
P. 124. Notes, L. 1. del. 1. for Exod. read Exer. Ibid.
L. 3. for Trin read Trib. Page 127. Notes, L. 14. for Anti-
Ep. read Epist. An.

112